1001 1320661

The Messages of The Bible

Sanders and Kent

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

W. P. McCarter.

The Messages of the Bible

EDITED BY

FRANK K. SANDERS, Ph.D., President of Washburn College, Topeka, Kansas, and Professor CHARLES F. KENT, Ph.D., of Yale University

A new series, in which emphasis is placed upon the concise, forcible, and realistic interpretation of the Bible. The books of the Bible are grouped according to a natural classification, their contents arranged in the order of appearance, and a scholarly yet popular paraphrase of their distinctive thought given in plain and expressive English. The purpose of this series is to enable any reader of the Bible to understand its meaning as a reverent scholar of to-day does, and in particular to receive the exact impression which the words as originally heard or read must have made upon those for whom they were delivered.

This series is not a substitute for the Bible, but an aid to the reverent, appreciative, and enthusiastic reading of the Scriptures; in fact, it will serve the purpose of an

ORIGINAL AND POPULAR COMMENTARY

Technicalities and unsettled questions will be, as far as possible, ignored. Each volume will be prepared by a leading specialist, and will contain such brief introductions as serve to put the reader into intelligent relation to the general theme treated. The editorial rearrangement of the order of the Biblical books or sections will represent the definite results of sober scholarship.

I. **The Messages of the Earlier Prophets.**

II. **The Messages of the Later Prophets.**

III. **The Messages of the Law Givers.**

IV. **The Messages of the Prophetical and Priestly Historians.**

V. **The Messages of the Psalmists.**

VI. **The Messages of the Sages.**

VII. **The Messages of the Poets.**

VIII. **The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers.**

IX. **The Messages of Jesus according to the Synoptists.**

X. **The Messages of Jesus according to John.**

XI. **The Messages of Paul.**

XII. **The Messages of the Apostles.**

The Messages of the Bible

EDITED BY

PROFESSOR FRANK K. SANDERS, PH.D.
formerly of Yale University
AND
PROFESSOR CHARLES F. KENT, PH.D.
of Yale University

VOLUME X

THE MESSAGES OF JESUS ACCORDING TO THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

BS
1791
M4
1.10

THE MESSAGES OF JESUS ACCORDING TO THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

THE DISCOURSES OF JESUS IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL, ARRANGED, ANALYZED AND FREELY RENDERED IN PARAPHRASE

BY

JAMES STEVENSON RIGGS, D.D.

Professor of Biblical Criticism in Auburn Theological Seminary

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1918

Copyright, 1907,
by
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Published, November, 1907

PREFACE

THIS little volume has a twofold aim. It seeks to give an interpretation of the Gospel and to set forth the Gospel's peculiar structure and nature. The former aim is accomplished by means of a paraphrase in which underlying connections of thought are supplied, figurative terms are explained and such amplifications of the text are introduced as shall make the meaning clear. Such a method gives room for only the results of exegesis. The discussions showing why and how these results are obtained belong to commentaries which consider the text piece by piece. If a paraphrase is of any value it is in presenting as a connected, readable whole what has been obtained by a careful critical study of each phrase and sentence. Such value we hope the book offers.

Every earnest student of this Gospel knows how prolonged and determined has been the battle of criticism over its worth and its authorship. Hardly a chapter has escaped destructive attack and noble work has been done in defense. In the form of introductions and explanatory additions I have sought to call attention not so much to negative critical theories as to the points against which

these theories have been directed. The striking difference between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics requires explanation. Has it been made by declaring that the book is a second-century production or by postulating another author than the Apostle John? It is to help the student to answer such questions for himself that all along the way attention has been called to those points in style, structure and thought which bear upon these critical inquiries. In considering them all may not come to the same conclusion, but to him who studies with devout, reverent sympathy one judgment is sure to be formed, and that is that the Gospel's exalted, spiritual conception and presentation of Christ are matchless.

I am indebted to many interpreters and critics for help and suggestions. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the unfailing courtesy and assistance of the editors at whose request this work was undertaken.

JAMES S. RIGGS.

AUBURN, *October* 21, 1907.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

	PAGE
I. The Problem of John's Gospel	1–15
II. Did the Apostle John write the Gospel?	16–35
1. External Evidence	16–21
2. Internal Evidence	22–35
III. Influences Formative of the Gospel	36–56
1. The Old Testament	45–47
2. The Teaching of Paul	48–50
3. The Ephesian Environment	51–56
IV. The Apostle John	57–71

THE PROLOGUE AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE HISTORY

Chapters I–II: 11

I. Its Representative Character	75–82
II. Its Interpretation: (1: 1–18)	82–85
III. The Beginnings of the History	86–87
IV. The Testimonies of the Baptist	88–95
1. First Testimony to Deputation from Jerusalem (1: 19–28)	88–90

PAGE

2. Second Testimony (1 : 29–34) 90–94
3. Third Testimony (1 : 35–42) 94–95

V. The Testimony of Philip and Nathanael (1 : 43–51) 96–97

VI. The Miracle at Cana (2 : 1–11) 98–99

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF JESUS

Incidents selected to illustrate that self-revelation of Jesus which awakened faith in Judea, Samaria and Galilee

Chapters II: 12—IV: 54

I. The Ministry in Judea (2 : 13–3 : 21) . . . 103–115
1. The Cleansing of the Temple (2 : 13–22) . 103–106
2. The Signs wrought in the city (2 : 23–25) . . 107
3. The Conversation with Nicodemus (3 : 1–15) 108–112
4. Comments of the Evangelist (3 : 16–21) . . 113–115

II. Jesus in the Country Districts of Judea (3 : 22–36) 116–121
1. The Last Witness of John the Baptist (3 : 22–26) 116–118
2. The Words of the Baptist (3 : 27–30) . . . 118–119
3. Reflections of the Evangelist (3 : 31–36) . . 119–121

III. The Ministry in Samaria (4 : 1–42) 122–128
1. The Conversation with the Samaritan Woman (4 : 1–26) 122–126
2. The Return of the Disciples (4 : 27–39) . . 126–128

IV. The Ministry in Galilee (4 : 43–54) 129–131
1. The Cure of the Nobleman's Son 129–131

Contents

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF JESUS

Events selected to show that self-revelation of the Messiah which was made in the presence of unbelief and opposition both in Galilee and Jerusalem

Chapters V–XII

PAGE

I. THE MIRACLE AT THE POOL OF BETHESDA (5 : 1–47) 135–150
1. Introductory (5 : 1) 135
2. Healing of the Cripple (5 : 2–16) 136–139
3. Teaching Following the Miracle (5 : 17–47) 139–150
(*a*) Outline of Teaching and Interpretation of verses 19–30 141–145
(*b*) Outline of Teaching and Interpretation of Verses 31–47 145–150

II. THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND (6 : 1–59) 150–166
1. Introductory 150–151
2. The Narrative Concerning the Miracle (6 : 1–21) 151–156
3. The Teaching of Jesus (6 : 26–59) 156–166
1. Introductory 156
2. The First Discourse: The True Bread (6:26–40) 157–161
3. The Second Discourse: Coming to (that is believing in) the Son (6 : 41–51) 162–164
4. The Third Discourse (the Appropriation of Life) (6: 52–58) 164–166

III. THE CRISIS IN GALILEE (6 : 60–71) 166–169
1. The Fourth Discourse: The Essential in the Messiah is the Spiritual (6 : 62–65) . . . 166–168
2. The Confession of Peter (6 : 67–71) . . . 168–169

IV. JESUS AT THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES (7:1–52) 169–184
1. Introductory 169–170

PAGE

2. The Conversation in Galilee with His Brethren (7 : 1–10) 171–172
3. The Public Interest in Him (7 : 11–13) . . 172
4. The Discourse Concerning His Teaching (7 : 14–24) 173–175
5. The Discourse Concerning His Origin (7 : 25–29) 176–178
6. The Discourse Regarding His Departure (7 : 30–34) 178–180
7. The Discourse Regarding the True Fountain (7 : 35–38) 180–181
8. Comment of the Evangelist (7 : 39) . . . 182
9. A General Summary of the Effect of these Addresses upon the Multitude and upon the Officials (7 : 40–52) 182–184

V. The Rupture in Jerusalem (8 : 12–59) . . . 184–201

1. Introductory 184–185
2. The First Discourse: Christ's Witness—I am the Light of the World (8 : 12–20) 185–187
3. The Second Discourse: The Seriousness of the Difference between the Jews and Jesus (8 : 21–30) 187–191
4. The Third Discourse (8 : 31–59) 191–201
   (1) Encouragement and Warning to be Faithful (8 : 31–36) 192–194
   (2) A Conversation showing what Their Claim of Descent from Abraham was Worth (8 : 37–47) . 195–197
   (3) The Preëminence of Jesus (8 : 48–59) . . . 198–201

VI. The Cure of the Man Born Blind (9 : 1–38) . 201–209

1. Introductory 201–202
2. The Account of the Miracle (9 : 1–7) . . . 202–204
3. The Consequent Discussions and Investigation (9 : 8–34) 204–208
4. The Spiritual Outcome of the Miracle (9 : 35–38) 208–209

PAGE

VII. THE SPIRITUAL TEACHING IN CONNECTION WITH THE CURE OF THE MAN BORN BLIND (9 : 39–10 : 42) 209–224

1. Introductory 209–211
2. The General Effects of the Ministry of Jesus upon the World as Suggested by His Experiences with the Blind Man (9 : 39–41) . . . 211–212
3. Jesus the Shepherd (10 : 1–21) 212–219
   (1) The Real Shepherd (10 : 1–6) 213–215
   (2) Jesus the Door of the Sheep (10 : 7–10) . . 215–216
   (3) The Good Shepherd (10 : 11–18) 216–219
   (4) The Result of these Teachings (10 : 19–21) . . 219
4. His Sweeping Claims (10 : 22–40) 219–224
   (1) His Witness to His Messiahship (10 : 22–30) . 220–222
   (2) The Justification of His Claim to be Son of God (10 : 34–39) 222–223
5. The Departure Beyond the Jordan (10 : 40–42) 224

VIII. THE RAISING OF LAZARUS (11:1–57) 224–236

1. Introductory 224–226
2. In the Perea (11 : 1–16) 226–228
3. In Bethany (11 : 17–46) 228–232
4. In Jerusalem (11 : 47–53) 233–235
5. Jesus Goes to Ephraim (11 : 54) 235
6. All Watch for Him in Jerusalem (11 : 55–57) 236

IX. THE THREEFOLD RELATIONSHIP OF CHRIST (12 : 1–36) 236–252

1. Introductory 236–238
2. The Supper in Bethany (12 : 1–8) 238–240
3. The Triumphal Entry (12 : 9–19) 240–244
4. The Request of the Greeks (12 : 20–36) and subsequent addresses 245–247
   (1) Introductory 245–246
   (2) First Address: The Way to Life's Enlargement and Glorification (12 : 24–26) 247–249

PAGE

(3) Second Address: The Significance of the Passion (12 : 27–33) 250
(4) The Perplexity of the Jews and Christ's Treatment of it (12 : 34) 251
(5) Their Duty in Reference to the Light (12 : 35, 36) 251–252

X. A Review of Jewish Unbelief by the Evangelist (12 : 37–50) 253
1. The Cause (12 : 37–43) 254–255
2. The Seriousness of the Unbelief of the Jews (12 : 44–50) 255–256

JESUS AND HIS DISCIPLES

The self-revelation made to faith

Chapters XIII–XVII

I. The Purification of the Disciples' Faith (13:1–30) 259–268
1. Introductory 259–261
2. General Introduction to Chapters 13–17 . . 261
3. The Washing of the Disciples' Feet (13 : 2–20) 261–265
4. The Dismissal of Judas (13 : 21–30) . . . 265–268

II. The Discourses (13 : 31–14 : 31) 268–284
1. Introductory 268–271
2. The Announcement of His Departure (13 : 31–38) 272
3. Comfort for Disciples Perplexed and Saddened by the Thought of His Departure (14 : 1–31) . 273–284
(1) The Promise of Reunion (14 : 1–11) . . . 273–277
(2) The Promise of Power (14 : 12–17) . . . 277–279
(3) The Promise of Personal Manifestation (14 : 18–26) 279–282
(4) The Bequest of Peace (14 : 27–30) . . . 282–284

III. The Relation of Christ's Disciples to Him and of the World to Them (15 : 1–16 : 6) . . 284–292
1. Introductory 284–287

PAGE

2. The Relation of Christ's Disciples to Him (15 : 1–17) 287–290
3. The Relation of the World to the Disciples (15 : 18–16 : 6) 290–292

IV. The Mission of the Spirit (16 : 7–15) . . . 292–295

V. The Joy of the Disciples on the Resurrection Morning (16 : 16–24) 296–299

VI. A Summary and a Conclusion (16 : 25–33) . . 299–301

VII. The Prayer of Jesus (17:1–26) 302–309
1. Introductory 302–304
2. A Prayer for Himself: Glorify Me (17 : 1–5) 304–305
3. Prayer for His Disciples: Keep them in Thy Name (17 : 6–19) 306–308
4. Prayer for Those Who through the Disciples' Word should Believe on Him (17 : 20–26) . . 308–309

THE PASSION

The Triumph of Unbelief. Victory through Death. The Highest self-revelation of Jesus

Chapters XVIII–XIX

I. General Introduction 313–314

II. The Arrest (18 : 1–12) 314–317

III. The Examination before Annas (18 : 13–27) . 317–320

IV. Jesus Before Pilate (18 : 28–19 : 16) 320–327

V. The Crucifixion and Death (19 : 17–30) . . 327–329

VI. The Four Enemies and Five Friends (19 : 23–27) 329–333

VII. The Burial (19 : 38–42) 333–335

THE RESURRECTION

The Beginning of Exaltation. The Messiah Glorified. Faith Triumphant

Chapter XX

PAGE

I. INTRODUCTORY 339–340

II. PETER AND JOHN AT THE EMPTY SEPULCHRE—JOHN'S FAITH (20 : 1–10) 340–342

III. CHRIST'S APPEARANCE TO MARY MAGDALENE (20 : 11–18) 342–344

IV. THE APPEARANCE TO THE DISCIPLES, THOMAS BEING ABSENT (20 : 19–23) 344–346

V. THE APPEARANCE TO THE DISCIPLES, THOMAS BEING PRESENT (20 : 24–29) 346–347

VI. CONCLUSION AND PURPOSE OF THE GOSPEL (20 : 30–31) 348

THE EPILOGUE

Chapter XXI

I. INTRODUCTORY 351–352

II. THE EPISODE AT THE SEA OF TIBERIAS (21 : 1–23) 352–357

III. CONCLUDING WORDS (21 : 24, 25) 357–358

APPENDIX

I. THE NARRATIVE OF THE WOMAN TAKEN IN ADULTERY (7 : 53–8 : 11) 361–364

II. BOOKS OF REFERENCE 364–370

III. INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES 373–374

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

I

THE PROBLEM OF JOHN'S GOSPEL

The two critical questions regarding John's Gospel

All critical questions concerning the Gospel of John really narrow down to these two: "Is the Gospel trustworthy history?" "Did the Apostle John write it?" The discussion of matters pertaining to the answering of these questions has called into being a voluminous literature. As might be expected, that literature furnishes all varieties of opinion, from a radical, negative reply on the one side, to a fully conservative estimate on the other. Through all the years in which this discussion has been going on the Church has read and cherished this priceless treasure of its Scriptures, finding in it that exalted and spiritual conception of her Lord which she believes is truthful and trustworthy. That the judgment of the Church shall ever be the unanimous verdict of criticism may be too much to expect, but it is safe to say that the time has gone by when such estimates as make the book wholly a creation of the imagination or a mere speculative theological treatise can find much support.

All varieties of answers

Book not a creation of the imagination; reality in the Gospel

In some form reality is expressed in the remarkable scenes and sayings of this Gospel. Whether that reality inheres in réminiscences which have been freely handled, or in constructions which reflect the mind and purpose of Jesus, *it is there*, and gives abiding value to the whole.

The problem stated

The problem concerning the Gospel has been to discover in it that substance of fact and teaching which shall constitute a reliable source of our knowledge of the Master and to give an explanation of the form under which it all has been presented to us.

The differences between Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel

Every reader of the Gospel is familiar with the striking differences between its account and that of the Synoptics. Except for a few incidents Judea, not Galilee, is the scene of its events. As we follow its story we move in a different atmosphere. The plain, simple recital of the other gospels gives place to a selection of events which are illustrative of the truth which the author sees and which it is his main object to set forth. So intent is he upon this that he does not hesitate to tell over quite fully some things which we already know, in order that we may have their inner meaning, and to leave out some whose omission surprises us, until we find that in another way he has given us also their deeper interpretation. By far the greater number of events seems to be those whose significance has come to light only in the fulness of his experience and in the progress of the truth. The narrative presupposes a Galilean ministry, but it was at Jerusalem, the theological

The Gospel a selection of events illustrative of truth

Narrative presupposes a Galilean ministry

centre of the nation, that Jesus spoke more largely of himself in terms that needed both time and experience to bring out their full value. The Gospel is supplementary, therefore, not so much in the way of seeking to add a series of events to those given us by the Synoptics as in offering us, by means of its peculiar reminiscences, a larger, more spiritual portrait of the world's Saviour. We are constantly brought face to face with the abiding realities of the spiritual. Jesus is their embodiment and their exponent. He is not a mere passing figure of earthly history; he is a revelation of the unseen; the exalted standard of spiritual achievement and destiny.

Gospel only in a certain sense supplementary

No writing of the New Testament consequently reveals more clearly what criticism speaks of as a "tendency" than does the Fourth Gospel. Indeed, it states its purpose in explicit terms "that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name" (20:21). The Fourth Gospel is no more a biography than are the others. It makes no claim any more than they do toward giving us a "life of Christ," hence lays no emphasis upon a complete record as regards the places of his activity or the deeds of his ministry. In this respect it offers no more of a problem than does the Gospel of Mark. Either is simply a collection of memorabilia; in the one case of experiences in Galilee, in the other in Judea. There is also a difference in the chronology of the Fourth Gospel, but here again the difference springs

A marked "tendency" in the Gospel

Not a biography any more than Mark

Difference in chronology

from the purpose of the Gospel. The times of most intense interest in the capital were when the people gathered from all parts of the land and from the Dispersion for the solemn feasts of the Temple ritual. In part from loyalty to the system under which he was born; in part to give to his teachings the widest reach, Jesus went up to the feasts. The record of his witness to himself contains, therefore, the reminiscence of the various festivals and the hints for a larger ministry than the Synoptics, with their account of but one passover, require. We are not left without indications in the Synoptics themselves, that John's chronology is the more likely (see Mk. 2: 23; Mk. 6: 39; Mk. 24: 37; Luke 13: 34), and some results are difficult to account for without the longer time and the repeated visits to Jerusalem which he supplies. When it comes to specific instances, such as the cleansing of the Temple or the date of the Last Supper and the Crucifixion, we believe that the ultimate decision will favor the accuracy of the Fourth Gospel.

The Synoptics hint at more than one year

The dates of John as to supper and crucifixion probably correct

The great outstanding difference, however, between John and the others is in his presentation of Jesus. This difference has been so emphasized by certain students of the Gospels as to compel a categorical "either—or"—either the Synoptic portrait must be accepted or the Johannine, since, they tell us, both cannot be historically true. "The Johannine Christ," says Holtzmann, "is complete from the very first. He appears without childhood and

Difference in the presentation of Jesus

Opinion of H. Holtzmann

youth, but is all along the divine Word manifested in the flesh. All traces of growth, of struggle, and of wrestling such as mark the growing Son of God of the Synoptics, are for the most part expunged and weakened, characteristically transformed and renovated. In this way is treated whatever speaks of dependence, as, for example, the stories of birth and youth; whatever points to deficient foreknowledge or to failure, the choice of the traitor Judas; whatever to real passivity, Gethsemane and Golgotha."[1] Wernle concludes a similar contrast with the words: "In fine, the difference between the Christ portraits may be expressed in the simple formula: Here man —there God."[2] "It is a peripatetic God who is depicted,"[3] says Wrede.

Wernle's judgment

Opinion of Wrede

The fact that these judgments are given by those who acknowledge that "Jesus Christ is Lord" makes them seem all the more prejudicial to the historicity of the Gospel. The simple question is, Are they correct? That the Fourth Gospel intends that we shall understand the exalted, divine character of Jesus is unquestionable. The description "the Word made flesh" is its own, and is of the highest significance, but we are not to forget that it is "the Word made *flesh*." That implies limitations and puts emphasis upon the humanity of Jesus. How can one whose body becomes weary (4: 6), whose spirit is vehemently

The Gospel does not hide the humanity of Jesus

[1] *Einleitung*, p. 432. [2] *Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu*, p. 25.
[3] *Character und Tendenz*, pp. 31, 37.

troubled (13: 21), and whose soul is deeply disturbed (12: 27) be said to give no evidence of his real humanity? Why does he ask for information (11: 34), declare that he can do nothing of himself (5: 19), and enter into all the earnestness of prayer, if we are to see in him only a God?

Beyschlag's judgment

Beyschlag's words are much nearer the truth when he says "The Fourth Gospel denies nothing that is innocently human to Jesus, neither hunger nor thirst, weariness nor sadness, suffering nor death, nor struggle of soul, neither the distinction of his will from the divine, nor the exercise of prayer and worship toward God; the Johannine Christ acknowledges all human dependence upon God. And it is simply not true, what is so often asserted, that John conceived his Christ as omniscient and omnipotent." [1] As to all lack of development set forth in Holtzmann's criticism that "the Johannine Christ is complete from the very first," the question is, For what kind of development do we look? The scope of the Gospel excludes designedly all consideration of the birth and childhood of Jesus. Believing, as we do, that Jesus became conscious of his Messiahship at the Baptism, and that the Temptation, which was the psychological outcome of the call given him at the Jordan to take up his Messianic place and work, both settled his supremacy and defined for him the character of his mission, we think it but in accord with the purpose of the writer that he should begin just where he does, after

Does the Gospel lack development?

Its point of view of Jesus

[1] *N. T. Theol.*, vol. ii, p. 416.

the trying days in the wilderness. From the first it is the Messiah in the full consciousness of his position and mission whom we are to contemplate. Neither in the Synoptics nor in John is there any development after the baptismal scene in the consciousness of Jesus as to his Messiahship. It is one thing to say this of Jesus; it is quite another to assert that in the recognition of this Messiahship there is no development in John's Gospel. The Synoptics let us see how gradual the process is by which the disciples attained this great conception. It is no contradiction of this belief that in the opening chapters of the Fourth Gospel some of those disciples in their first enthusiasm declare that they have found the Messiah, inasmuch as they use a term which the common expectation and their enthusiasm suggested, but which they then little understood. In the course of the comment attention is called to the interpretative additions of the evangelist which belong to his point of view rather than to the time to which they are assigned (see 1: 29; 2: 21). Making allowance for these, and being careful not to read into terms more than the situation allows according to the Gospel itself, we shall find reason for the modification of the judgment that there is no development. Chapter 7 gives us pretty clear evidence that on the part of the people there was no such definite issue as the no-development theory suggests. "Some of the multitude, therefore, when they heard these words, said, This is of a truth the prophet. Others said,

Neither the Synoptics nor John shows development in consciousness of Jesus

The Gospel shows development in the recognition of the Messiah

This is the Christ. But some said, What, doth the Christ come out of Galilee?" (7: 40, 41). Even later than this, at the Feast of Dedication, the Jews ask, "How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou art the Christ tell us plainly" (10: 24). Facts like these warrant the conclusion that "the writer of this Gospel is as clearly conscious as any of the Synoptists of the real course of events, and that he, too, was well aware that the Messiah, when he came, had not forced a peremptory claim upon an unwilling people. The anticipated confessions of the early chapters, whatever we may otherwise think of them, are really subordinate and (so to speak) accidental; the main course of the ministry is not conceived differently in the Fourth Gospel and in the Synoptics."[1]

The difference between Synoptics and John is to be understood in the realization of the position of John

If, then, in the point of his humanity, and in the setting forth of that reserve of the actual declaration of his Messiahship the two narratives are not so unlike as one might suppose, wherein does the difference lie? We can answer this only as we try to realize the position of the writer. Years had gone since the departure of Jesus from the world, Jerusalem had been destroyed, Christianity had found its way far beyond the limits of the Holy Land. The meaning of the spiritual, universal Messiahship had grown clearer and more comprehensive. Sayings which at the time they were first uttered may have seemed vague, certainly less applicable to the exigencies of life than the

[1] Sanday: *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 165.

pithy, sententious maxims or the striking suggestive parables of the Synoptics, became definite and rich in content. One after another these sayings were recalled from those memorable struggles in the capital. Together they set forth the fundamental and essential significance of him who uttered them. The old and often-cited analogy between the accounts of Socrates given by Xenophon and Plato is apt and forceful. How meagre after all would have been our real knowledge of the great Athenian teacher had not Plato opened to us the wealth and worth of his philosophy.

The analogy of Xenophon and Plato in their relation to Socrates in point

It is objected that there is something monotonous in John's depictions of Jesus; something one-sided. Again we must return to the specific purpose of the Gospel. Variety of circumstances, the stage setting of the drama, the scenery of the picture—these are all entirely subordinate to the one central person upon whom the eye of the interpreter is fixed. We must look at *him*. All the variety that is of any moment is in what he says of himself; in what he is and means to men, to the world as his word here or there reveals it. And so the repeated "I ams"— the statements which carry us to the underlying spiritual relations existing between him and the Father; the purport of his mission for the spiritual awakening, judgment and salvation of men—are the substance of the Gospel. If there is monotony in them, it is such as might come from one's trying to describe the meaning of the sun to our phys-

The Gospel is one-sided and somewhat monotonous because of its purpose

ical universe. In all this lies the real difference in the presentation of Jesus. And so we are brought face to face with the discourses which give us just this presentation. They have long been the chief source of objection to this Gospel. "A Jesus who preached alternately in the manner of the Sermon on the Mount and of John 14–17 is a psychological impossibility."[1] "To discourse in Synoptic and Johannine fashion is precisely what Jesus did not do."[2] These are decisive words. What shall be said of them? It is vain to enter a wholesale denial of the marked difference between the style and general content of the discourses of Jesus found in the Synoptics and those of the Fourth Gospel. The difference certainly exists. Can we satisfactorily account for it without sacrificing the value of the teaching? The best way is first to look closely at the discourses themselves with a view to discovering some of their characteristics. First and most conspicuous is the fact that all the speakers in this Gospel have the same style, which is also the style of the First Epistle of John. It has been well said that there is "a Hebrew soul in the Greek language of the evangelist." All the way through the vocabulary is relatively poor and the forms of expression simple. The whole is under the mould of one mind; the diction is from one hand. To the extent of style, therefore, the Gospel bears a distinct Johannine im-

The discourses form a chief objection to the Gospel

Jülicher's and Wernle's opinions

A marked difference of style in Fourth Gospel

All the discourses have one style

They bear a distinct Johannine impress

[1] Jülicher, *Introd. to N. T.*, p. 421.

[2] Wernle, *Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu*, p. 24.

press. To this extent there is a modification of the original form of the teaching conveyed. Again, it appears upon close examination that some statements which at first sight look like integral parts of various discourses really belong to the evangelist. Notable instances of these are found in 3: 16–21; 3: 31–36, and in various places all through the Gospel (see the interpretation and introduction thereto). Without any linguistic mark of change, the discourse passes over into comments by the writer. In the full light of his understanding of the meaning of his Master's life, he added these interpretative comments. Such treatment indicates certainly considerable freedom and makes very plain a subjective element in the Gospel.

Comments of evangelist added to words of Jesus

Once more there are instances where it seems clear that the evangelist has brought together into the form of a single discourse words spoken at different times and on different occasions. Two of these may be found in 12: 37–50 and in 5: 19 ff. In the first case the evangelist gathers together some of the main teachings of the Gospel upon the causes of unbelief and puts them into the form of an address. The words are introduced by the statement, "But Jesus cried out and said" (v. 44). There is no indication of either occasion or locality for the words spoken. The words have a general character, and themes which have been before us in earlier chapters reappear. It is virtually an address composed by the evangelist. That does not mean that it is not true in substance. It is rather

At times evangelist constructs discourses

These are true in substance

a presentation, in the form of a summary, of cognate words which Jesus had spoken at different times and on different occasions. The instance in the fifth chapter is somewhat similar. The discussion of it will be found in connection with the chapter in the interpretation. These various characteristics will give some idea of what is called the subjectivity of the Gospel. By some critics this subjectivity is discernible to a greater extent than by others, but all discover it, and it leads to a most interesting study. It will undoubtedly be impossible to separate the Johannine element completely. The combination is no such mechanical affair as partition theories often assert. Indeed the remarkable unity of structure in the Gospel makes *any* form of partition theory unlikely.[1] We are to think of the Apostle as so at one with the teaching of his Master that the statements given us are more analogous to chemical than mechanical combinations. The substance of the teaching and the form of expression are quite inseparable. "Recent criticism is steadily tending to the conclusion that the form in which the discourses of Christ are recorded in the Fourth Gospel is in part due to the evangelist himself."[2] "The Gospel of John is a distillation of the life and teaching of Jesus from the alembic of the Apostle's own mind."[3] Once more we would em-

All commentators discover a subjective element in the Gospel

Partition theories untenable in view of unity of structure

Tendency of recent criticism in regard to subjective element in discourses

[1] Wendt's brilliant work is the best recent attempt in the way of a partition theory.

[2] T. H. Bernard.

[3] Stevens, *Theology of N. T.*, p. 172.

phasize the difference between the audiences of Galilee and Jerusalem. In the latter place he was face to face with the expert theologians of the nation. They were always in the groups that gathered about him. This fact of itself would explain in part the change of manner of address and the change of subject. Add to this the subjective element to which we have called attention, and we are a long way toward the explanation of this Gospel's presentation of Jesus through the discourses which form so large a part of it. We are now ready to return to our question as to whether such a "distillation" diminishes the value of the teaching. And this suggests the further question, whether in such a field the characterizations "true to history" and "true to truth" must be identical. If they must, then a shadow falls at once upon the pages of the Gospel, for, in that case, unless the discourses are all *ipsissima verba* they are not true to history. If we may justly distinguish between these descriptions and find in these discourses a truth which is even surer because it in part is a Spirit-inspired interpretation of words that were actually said, and a life that was really lived, then the value of the teaching is enhanced. The substance of it came from the mind of no mere disciple. The claims set forth and the exalted declarations found on every page are not the creation of some follower of Jesus whether of the first or second century. Jesus himself is the only adequate source of the profound spiritual truth which it contains. Arrangement,

Jesus faced an entirely different audience in Jerusalem

Does the subjective element diminish value of teaching?

Discourses true to truth

Jesus himself only adequate source of the truth

shaping, interpretation, are due to him who sought to present it to men that they might more clearly discern the Son of God and through faith in him have life.

The historical settings of discourses true to fact

While we find, however, that the discourses are best described as true to truth, it is just as sure that the historical settings of these discourses are true to fact. Details in support of this statement will be given later in another connection. We refer to them now simply that we may make a definite affirmative answer to the first of the two questions with which we began: "Is the Gospel trustworthy history?"

II

DID THE APOSTLE JOHN WRITE THE GOSPEL?

1. *External Evidence.*

For convenience in description, we have referred to the Gospel as John's Gospel, and in the same way have called attention to a "Johannine impress." We must now consider the question whether such references are justifiable.

Truth not dependent upon names

Truth certainly is not dependent upon names. And yet a gospel is not quite like an epistle, as, for example, the Epistle to the Hebrews. It purports to give historical settings, and conveys the impression of an eye-witness. The value of these certainly is enhanced if we can have assurance that one who actually took part in the scenes he describes has given us at first hand the record of them.

The value of a Gospel enhanced if genuine

Whether this first-hand recorder was John the Apostle, or another "disciple of the Lord" who had the privilege of personal companionship with Jesus, may not be of very great importance as far as the facts and truth of the Gospel are concerned. Either might satisfy the demands of the case; certainly better than some writer of the second century wholly dependent upon sources from a generation with which he had little to do. And yet we must not forget that Luke's Gospel has come to us in just this way. The determination of the whole matter is from criticism of the evidence. Every scrap of this evidence has been again and again discussed and—as is well known—judgments upon it widely differ. If one desires to go over the evidence step by step, such works as Watkins' Bampton Lectures of 1890, or the more recent works of James Drummond [1] and V. H. Stanton [2] will be found very helpful. The space at our disposal allows us to call attention only to the salient points and to the verdict of sane and careful criticism. We turn first to ask what was the testimony of the earliest witnesses upon the matter of authorship. A safe point with which to begin critical inquiry is near the close of the second century, for "from A.D. 180 John's Gospel was recognized in the Church as the work of the Apostle John who died in Ephesus." [3] The extent

Question can be determined by each one from evidence

Works helpful for the study of this evidence

Best point at which to begin critical inquiry

[1] "*An Inquiry into the Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.*"
[2] *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part I.
[3] Jülicher, *Introd. to N. T.* (English edition), p. 405.

Extent of witness at end of second century

of this testimony may be realized by noting that its factors were Irenæus in Gaul, Heracleon in Italy, Tertullian at Carthage, Tatian at Rome and in Syria, Polycrates at Ephesus, Theophilus at Antioch, and Clement at Alexandria. This testimony, in effect, carries us far back of the time in which it was given. There are also names which bridge over the years to the very Apostle himself. Starting with Irenæus we read in Haer. iii, 11,[1] "That John, the disciple of the Lord who also leaned upon his breast, himself also published the Gospel while dwelling at Ephesus in Asia." Now Irenæus connects himself with John through Polycarp, for in his letter to Florinus [2] he writes: "I saw thee (Florinus) while I was still a boy in Lower Asia, in company with Polycarp. For I distinctly remember the incidents of that time better than events of recent occurrence; for the lessons received in childhood, growing with the growth of the soul, become identified with it; so that I can describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and his manner of life and his personal appearance, and the discourses which he held before the people, and how he would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord and about His miracles and about His teaching, Polycarp, as having received

Names which bridge over the years to the Apostle

Testimony of Irenæus

Irenæus connects himself through Polycarp with John

[1] This work was written *circa* A.D., 180–190. [2] *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* v, 20.

them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, would relate altogether in accordance with the Scriptures." It is objected to this testimony that there is a confusion of persons in it, and that the John of Asia Minor whom Polycarp knew, was John the Presbyter, instead of John the Apostle. But in his letter to Victor [1] he again connects Polycarp with John, and in such a way as to make the reference quite clear. Besides, as both Drummond [2] and Sanday [3] remark, Irenæus was not shut up to Polycarp and Papias for all his knowledge about John. How unlikely that a man who was himself a great traveller; who met the noted leaders of the Church in different great centres; who succeeded Pothinus, a man ninety years of age when he died and a storehouse of traditions, should have never had his confusion set right! The first name of importance which meets us as we move back from 180 A.D. is Justin Martyr, whose works appeared about the middle of the second century. It is now generally conceded that he used the Fourth Gospel, and to Dr. Drummond, who has made a searching examination of Justin's relation to the Gospel, the conclusion which seems most satisfactory is "that Justin regarded the Fourth Gospel as one of the historical Memoirs of Christ, but that it is not improbable that he believed in its Johannine authorship."[4] Harnack's cautious

Objected that Irenæus confused the Apostle with John the Presbyter

Is such confusion in view of the position and relations of Irenæus likely?

Justin Martyr

[1] *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* v, 24. [2] *Character and Authorship*, p. 348.
[3] *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 60–62.
[4] *Character and Authorship*, p. 161.

Harnack's cautious statement

statement covers well the situation, namely, that it cannot be proved that Justin reckoned the Fourth Gospel "among the Memoirs of the Apostles and regarded it as Apostolic —Johannine. . . . However, I will not treat it as out of the question that Justin held the Fourth Gospel as Apostolic—Johannine. . . . So, then, one must leave open the possibility, yea, a certain probability, that the designation of the Fourth Gospel as the work of the Apostle was to be found already, in 155–160 A.D., namely on the part of Justin." [1]

Papias

Papias is the next witness on our way back toward the beginning of the second century A.D. He was Bishop of Hieropolis, and his life extends from the latter years of the first century (70 or 80 A.D.) to near the middle of the second. What little we have from his pen is found in Eusebius,[2] and has been the subject of repeated discussion. It is he who introduces us to "John the Presbyter," about whose actual existence critics are yet disputing. In accord with the principle of Eusebius to say very little regarding books which were entirely undisputed, no argument can be made against the existence of the Fourth Gospel from the silence of Papias. Rather, it shows that he did make use of the Gospel, but we have no direct testimony from him to its authorship. The bearing of the witness of Polycarp upon the question of authorship is much the same. It is important, however, to note just his position and relationship to the Apostle John. His martyrdom

The silence of Papias does not argue against existence of Fourth Gospel

Witness of Polycarp; his relation to John

[1] *Chronologie* i, p. 673.

[2] *Hist. Eccles.*, iii, 36, 39.

took place in 155 or 156 A.D., and he declared that he had been a Christian eighty-six years. Interpreting this as the length of his life, as is generally done, we are carried back to A.D. 70 as the time of his birth. If John the Apostle lived in Ephesus (see chapter 3), Polycarp was his contemporary for most, or all, of the time of that residence; and "the accounts which he gave (to Irenæus) of his intercourse with John" mean much when it comes to a general estimate of the evidence for authorship. The brief review of that evidence which we have made shows us that the direct witness to authorship is very scanty for the time preceding Irenæus. The same is not true of the witness to the existence of the Gospel. Is not the real reason for the difference the fact that the authorship of John was not a disputed question? Certainly for Irenæus there was no such question, and, bearing in mind his relation to the men who had lived since the days of John, could he have been silent had such a question come from earlier days? It is said, however, that he is attributing to John the Apostle what should be assigned to John the Presbyter. Now it is true that more than once the very epithet which we should like for the sake of certainty, namely, "Apostle," is wanting. The John to whom reference is made is called "the beloved disciple"—a description which would apply to John the Presbyter—but is it likely that Polycarp or those who were in close contact with him, were mistaken as to the source of the Gospel which they certainly treated

Witness to existence of Gospel and its authorship not equally full

The epithet "Apostle" wanting often

The description "beloved disciple" might fit John the Presbyter

as Apostolic, or that knowing that John the Presbyter was its author, they were so indifferent to the fact, that the whole Church at the close of the second century mistook him for the Apostle? What might perhaps be maintained by considering each witness as isolated has little force when we remember the living relation in which they all stood. The most reasonable supposition is that whenever they refer to John, they mean the Apostle, and that the tradition of authorship, which is clear and decisive in the year 180 A.D., has had living testimony to its truth from generation to generation—even from John to Irenæus.

It is the close personal relationship of the witnesses that has weight

2. *Internal Evidence.*

Course of argument

In turning to consider the evidence from the Gospel itself, no better course can be followed than is outlined in the old familiar argument which advanced by given stages from the nationality of the writer, through the characteristics of his narrative, to the specific question as to who in himself met best the requirements which they collectively demand. In our progress we may thus note by the way the discussions of most recent criticism and their value.

First proposition: author a Jew

Our first proposition, then, is that the writer of the Gospel, whoever he may have been, was *a Jew*. No fact regarding the book's authorship is perhaps more generally conceded than this. "The author," says Thoma, "imbibed with his mother's milk the Jewish way of thinking." [1] "There is

This fact generally conceded

[1] *Genesis des Evan. Johan.*, p. 787.

nothing to preclude his Jewish birth; his style and methods of presentment favor its admission." [1] The intimate friend of Jesus, found in the Gospel, must have been a Hebrew; his Semitic extraction is recognizable both in his style with its dislike for periodic structure and in his forms of thought." [2] "The evidence is overwhelming that the author of the Gospel was a Jew." [3] The most patent evidence of this is, perhaps, the style of the Greek. Every student of New-Testament Greek knows that this Gospel is one of the easiest books in the New Testament to read, but not every student knows why it is so. The simplicity of diction is because of its Hebraic character. The Hebrew and Aramaic have comparatively little syntax. There is no great variety of connecting particles; an absence of periodic structure; a fondness for parallelism of sentences. All these appear in the style of the Fourth Gospel. "So [4] completely is this (the Hebrew) character maintained throughout, that there is hardly a sentence which might not be translated literally into Hebrew or Aramaic without any violence to the language or the sense."

Seen in the style of the Greek

Another proof that the author was a Jew is found in his intimate knowledge of Jewish customs and conditions. His knowledge of the Jewish feasts, for example, extends to particulars to which he refers simply in passing, as

Seen again in the author's intimate knowledge of Jewish customs and conditions

[1] H. T. Holtzmann, *Das Evan. des Johannes*, p. 16.
[2] Jülicher, *Introd. N. T.*, p. 415.
[3] Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 128.
[4] Lightfoot, *Expositor*, 1890, p. 17.

though they were quite familiar to him (see 10: 22; 7: 37, 38). One of the important questions in the days of Jesus was regarding purification. This appears in the Gospel (see 2: 6; 3: 25; 11: 55; 18: 28; 19: 31). The fourth chapter shows the feud between the Jews and Samaritans (4: 9, 20; 8: 48). In the same chapter comes to light the attitude of the doctors of the law toward women (4: 27). All through the *Jewish* expectation regarding the Messiah is set forth, now in connection with the Baptist's preaching (1: 19); now in the discussions of the people (7: 27, 42; 12: 34); now in the references to Scripture with which they were familiar (5: 39, 46; 12: 41). Instead of the Sadducees, the high-priests (who at this time were Sadducees) are referred to, and their acceptance of the dictation of the Pharisees, because of the fear of the people, as shown in the Gospel, is a fine historical touch.[1]

Examples of this knowledge

Jewish expectation regarding Messiah depicted

A third proof that a Jew wrote the Gospel is that some of the quotations from the Old Testament indicate a knowledge of the original Hebrew Scriptures, either directly or indirectly, through an Aramaic paraphrase.[2] The three passages which are of interest in this connection are: 19: 37—"They shall look on him whom they pierced," which is taken from Zec. 12: 10. The LXX. of this reads, "because they insulted," instead of "whom they pierced." Here another version than the Septuagint may have been

Seen in the manner of some of the Old-Testament quotations

[1] See Lightfoot, *Expositor*, 1890, p. 86.
[2] Sanday, *Expositor*, 1892, p. 181.

used, but 12: 40 (Isa. 6: 10) and 13: 18 (Ps. 41: 9) require a different solution (see commentaries *in loco*).

Taken together, these considerations have left little room for doubt that a Jew wrote the Gospel. The objection framed from the use of the designation "the Jews" is not significant, as it is now understood that the description is not used in a spirit of contempt, but is simply historical.

The use of the term "the Jews" not a real objection

The next proposition, that the author was a *Palestinian* Jew, has not received such general recognition as the first. A supposedly effective argument against this proposition is drawn from the topography of the Gospel. It is safe to say that the geographical details of the Gospel no longer make any valid argument against it; indeed, so much of its geography has been confirmed by recent research that the whole consideration passes over to the positive side, and may be used as a support against other points of attack. No mistake has been made regarding Bethany beyond Jordan; it is in no way confounded with Bethany "fifteen furlongs" from Jerusalem (11: 18). The old difficulty regarding Sychar is explained by the site of the present Askar. So, too, "Ænon near Salim" has been satisfactorily located, as well as Ephraim in the wilderness. The noteworthy feature of the author's geographical knowledge is that it concerns all parts of the land, and it comes to light incidentally as though he were familiar with the scenes to which he refers. He thus speaks of the whole region about Jacob's well; of the scenery and surroundings of the

Second proposition: author a Palestinian Jew

The geographical details of the Gospel do not now argue against this

Notable feature of author's geographical knowledge

Sea of Galilee; and of localities in and about Jerusalem. Either he must have gained his knowledge from books—a means which Sanday [1] has shown quite inadequate for such knowledge as is evident—or he must have resided a long time in the land as did Origen or Jerome, or he must have been a native of the land. Between the second and third explanations decision can be made sure, perhaps, only by an appeal to other characteristics of the Gospel which shall confirm this accuracy of geographical detail. There is nothing in the geography itself which stands in the way of Palestinian origin. Furrer's objection,[2] that the use of the "Sea of Tiberias" for the "Sea of Galilee" is a mark of second-century origin, may be accounted for on the theory of the date of the Gospel being just at the beginning of the transition from one form to the other.[3]

Use of the description "Sea of Tiberias" may point to time of transition

The expression "high priest of that year"

One historical detail is usually cited as indicating a writer from some centre in the Dispersion, and that is the reference to the high-priest of "that year" (11: 49, 51; 18: 13). Of this H. Holtzmann says, "that it is due to the author's familiarity with the practice in Asia Minor of annually changing the high-priest of the new temple dedicated to the worship of the Emperor, the year being called by his name." [4] This could only be on the assumption

[1] *Expositor*, 1892, pp. 164–170.
[2] *Zeitschrift für die N. T. Wissenschaft*, 1902, p. 261.
[3] See Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 114.
[4] *Lehrb. d. Einleitung in die N. T.*, p. 469.

that heathen custom in the matter was to be taken as the norm of custom in Jerusalem—an unlikely assumption for a Jew anywhere. Why is not the explanation of Weiss and others completely satisfactory, "He was the high-priest of that noteworthy, fatal year"? Weiss's view satisfactory

Such points as are cited to show the influence of Alexandrian thought, and hence that the Gospel is from the pen of an extra-Palestinian Hellenist, will be noted in the chapter on the formative influences of the Gospel.

The third proposition, which we now must consider, is that the writer of the Gospel was an *eye*-witness of the events he narrates and a personal companion of the Lord. Just here it is important to emphasize again the fact that the whole consideration of the trustworthiness of the Gospel rests upon two bases, the general character of the discourses and the historicity of their narrative settings. We have already seen that we must, for the discourses, allow a considerable subjectivity which leaves them true to truth, if not always in *ipsissimis verbis*. The question now is, Have we such a presentation of the historical situation, revealed in events, conditions, and atmosphere, as leads us to conclude that one who was actually present, an actor in the scenes he depicts, or a witness of the events he narrates, is giving us the record of the whole? So important is it to keep this question in mind as one considers the successive scenes of the Gospel, that we have called the reader's attention to it in various introductions to the scenes Third proposition: author an eye-witness

Trustworthiness of Gospel rests on two bases

themselves. At this point we should like to give a unified impression of the testimony. It is well to note at the outset that in several different places the writer makes the distinct claim to being an eye-witness. These passages are 1: 14; 19: 35; 21: 24, and 1 John 1: 1. Each merits a moment's attention. The First Epistle of John "is so closely connected with the Fourth Gospel in vocabulary, style, thought, scope, that these two books cannot but be regarded as works of the same author." [1] The declaration of the opening words of the Epistle is, therefore, pertinent. "That which was from the beginning, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we *beheld*, (ἐθεασάμεθα) and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life." To behold (θεᾶσθαι) is, in the New Testament, used uniformly of bodily vision and, taken together with the words "our hands handled," makes a strong assertion of actual personal association with Jesus. Of the same decisive character is the statement in John 1: 14, "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld, ἐθεασάμεθα, his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father) full of grace and truth." The third passage, 19: 35, "And he that hath seen hath borne witness and his witness is true; and he (ἐκεῖνος) knoweth that he saith true that ye also may believe," has caused some difficulty because of the peculiar form of reference in ἐκεῖνος. Who

The author claims to be an eye-witness

Passage in 1 John 1: 1

John 1: 14

John 19: 35

[1] Westcott, *Epistles of John*, p. 30. This is also the judgment of several critics who do not accept the authorship of John the Apostle for the Gospel.

is referred to thereby? Is it the author objectifying himself (Weiss, Godet, Bruce, Westcott), or is he pointing to Christ (Zahn, Sanday)? Godet has shown the absurdity of referring it to a third party and thus construing it into a denial of the apostolic origin of the Gospel. The first interpretation is to be preferred; it is in keeping with the usage of ἐκεῖνος elsewhere in the Gospel (see 9: 37). In 21: 24 we have the confirmation of the trustworthiness of the Apostle's record as that of an eye-witness. The "we" may be the Ephesian elders. Such is the direct claim which the writer makes. What does the Gospel offer us to substantiate the claim? Leaving particulars to be noted in connection with the interpretation of the different chapters, we offer several general considerations:

John 21: 24

How does the Gospel substantiate this claim?

(1) Details regarding time, place, persons, which have no especial importance for the narrative are best explained as personal reminiscences. "On the morrow he seeth Jesus coming" (1: 29). "It was about the tenth hour" (1: 39). "The third day there was a marriage," etc. (2: 1). "Philip answered him" (6: 7). "Now the servant's name was Malchus" (18: 10). There are many such unessential details in the Gospel.

Unessential details best explained as personal reminiscences

(2) The persons who enter upon the scene are singularly life-like and real—the Baptist, Peter, Andrew, Thomas, Judas, Pilate, Martha, and Mary. The first chapter, for example, is remarkable not only in its group

Persons depicted in singularly life-like way

of personages, but in their distinctness and historical truthfulness, as we can verify them from other sources.

The Gospel is singularly faithful to the historical situation in regard to the two great parties in Jerusalem. The Pharisees in most cases take the initiative against Jesus. When the Sadducees come to the front, as in 11: 47–50, it is with their characteristic fear in mind, "The Romans will come and take away both our place and nation." Pilate's pitiful position between Rome and the relentless accusers of Jesus is vividly portrayed. These are but some of the figures that play consistently their parts in the scenes that are true to the times in which Jesus lived.

Touches of local color in various places

(3) In various scenes there are touches of local color which imply personal experience. This appears, for example, in the conversation of Jesus with the Samaritan woman; in her appeal to Jacob, and in her question about the place where men ought to worship. Chapters 6, 7, 9 have many similar touches in them.

These, together with the writer's familiarity with the land of Palestine and with Jerusalem, are points not easily accounted for, if the writer himself was not an eye-witness.

Dr. Drummond's opinion

Dr. Drummond does not feel their cogency, thinking that such an "unexampled, unknown, and unmeasured literary genius"[1] as the writer of the Gospel was, could have produced "an untrue narrative possessing such verisimilitude," or, at least, that it would be hazardous to say that

[1] *Authorship and Character*, p. 378.

he could not. To which Sanday's reply is certainly sufficient, that "where facts can be explained easily and naturally without having recourse to any such extraordinary assumption, the world is content so to explain them."

Was the eye-witness an apostle?

In addition to all these evidences for an eye-witness who was a Jew of Palestine, have we any which show us that he may have been a member of the little band chosen by the Lord to accompany him through the land, and carry on his work after he was gone? In other words, have we any reasons for thinking that the writer was an apostle? It is well known that the writer does not name himself, but there are designations which point to some one who was very near the Master. Thus in 21: 20 Peter refers to "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and he is spoken of as reclining near to Jesus at the supper (13: 23). He also stood by the mother of Jesus at the cross (19:26), and was in company with Peter, when Jesus appeared to the disciples on the shore of the Lake of Galilee (21: 7). At the opening of the story of the Gospel two disciples heard Jesus speak, accepted his invitation to go to his abode. One of the two was Andrew. The other, who remembers distinctly the hour when they went with Jesus (four o'clock in the afternoon), is not named. Is this perhaps the one who is afterward called "the beloved disciple?" Before this question can be answered, it will be well to ascertain if the Gospel itself gives us evidence of the writer's close fellowship with the Lord and his disciples. It is Weiz-

Designations and incidents point to some one very near the Master

Weizsäcker's view

säcker who thinks that the portrait of Jesus given us in the Fourth Gospel could not have been drawn by a personal friend.[1] Exactly the opposite seems to us the case. The very interpretation which it offers presupposes an intimacy in association which would prepare him for this portrayal. Even amid the limitations of his first discipleship, a nature such as the writer of this Gospel reveals would give response to the exalted truth to which he listened. How much more would he be able to glorify the life which in earthly fellowship had been so spiritual, when his own experience had come fully to understand its divine meaning.

Evidence that the unnamed disciple came close to Jesus

Here and there are hints that this "unnamed" disciple was admitted to very close personal relationship with Jesus. He gives us more than once the reason why the Master adopted a certain course of action (2: 24; 4: 1; 5: 6; 6: 15; 7: 1; 13: 1; 16: 19). He lets us see that often the mind of Jesus was open to him (6: 6, 11; 18: 4; 19: 25) regarding the future. At the last supper he reclined upon his bosom; he followed him to the high-priest's palace, stood by the cross, and there received the care of his mother. Surely these are marks of especial friendship.

Evidence that he was closely associated with the band of apostles

No one questions the fact that after their especial appointment the disciples were constantly with Jesus in his journeyings through the land. If the data which may be gathered from the Gospel lead to any conclusion, it is that the writer of it was closely acquainted with this chosen

[1] *Das Apostol. Zeit.*, p. 517.

band. Their thoughts, secret fears, and anxious questionings are known to him (2: 17; 4: 27; 6: 19, 60; 16: 17; 20: 25). He tells us how they changed their views of certain matters, as the development of events brought them better understanding (2: 21; 11: 13; 12: 16; 13: 28; 20: 9). To him we are indebted for certain conversations of Nathanael, Peter, Thomas, Philip, and others. Indeed, his whole relation to the disciples, as one of their number, seems natural and ordinary. He keeps back his name, but does not thereby wish to appear mysterious. As for claiming any superiority to Peter, it is not apparent, unless one construes the phrase "the disciple whom Jesus loved," which is descriptive of personal thanksgiving and praise, into an assumption of pride.

He claims no superiority to Peter

There seems sufficient reason, therefore, for saying that the writer of the Gospel was a Palestinian Jew, who enjoyed close companionship with Jesus and his disciples. We now reach the critical question, Who was he? If the conclusions formed at each step of our advance are correct, then the writer must have been either the Apostle John or some disciple, equally favored. Students familiar with the criticism of the Gospel know that each alternative has been taken and defended. It will be of interest to examine first the theory which ascribes the Gospel to "a disciple of the Lord" who is not John the Apostle. One form of this theory is given by Dr. Delff, and is to the effect that the beloved disciple was a native of Jerusalem, a member

If the previous steps are sure, the writer may have been either John or some favored disciple

Delff's theory

of the aristocracy, and belonged to one of the high-priests' families. The supports for this are the statement (18: 15) that "that disciple was known unto the high-priest"; that so large a part of the Gospel has to do with Jerusalem; that Polycrates speaks of John wearing the πέταλον (the high-priest's golden plate); that Papias (seconded by the de Boor Fragment) declares that both the sons of Zebedee were "slain by the Jews." This "beloved disciple" can be identified with John the Presbyter. As has been said before, one who stood in such close contact with Jesus and the actual scenes of his life would satisfy the requirements of the Gospel itself. There are certain difficulties in the problem which would be met by the acceptance of the Presbyter John as the author of the Gospel, but there are other difficulties created which are certainly grave. The best theory is that which will cover most satisfactorily the largest number of facts. Dr. Delff's view compels him to consider the Galilean events of the Gospel as later insertions; it makes the necessity of accounting for the John who appears with Peter in the Acts and in Galatians; it accepts the two witnesses as to the violent death of the Apostle, as against the common tradition of the Church that the Apostle did not die in that way. Furthermore, any identification of John the Apostle with John the Presbyter must assume confusion on the part of those whose relations to each other in life and work make such confusion difficult to accept. Partition theories admitting

Objections to Dr. Delff's view

two hands in the construction of the Gospel run against the serious difficulty of the structural unity of the Gospel. It is, therefore, to John the Apostle we turn, as giving us the best answer to the question of authorship. We know from the Synoptics that he was one of an inner group from the Twelve which was admitted to especial privileges. It is no argument against his possible relationship with some of the leaders in Jerusalem that he was a fisherman in Galilee, and his residence in Ephesus, in the latter part of his life, has not been successfully disputed. It is not claimed that all the difficulties of this intricate problem are done away with by attributing the Gospel to John the Apostle; rather, that this view of the matter meets the requirements of the case more fully than any other. As has been well said, "in literary questions we cannot look for demonstration"; certainly not for such demonstration as shall convince all critics. One conclusion, however, is sure: that the Gospel gives us a Christ whose portraiture does not contradict that of the Synoptics, but rather enlarges and glorifies it, and places it in an historical setting which is unquestionably trustworthy.

The author, John

John's authorship does not do away with all difficulties

It meets requirements of the case more fully than other views

III

INFLUENCES FORMATIVE OF THE GOSPEL

Exact date of writing of Gospel uncertain

Testimony as to its origin

Clement of Alexandria

Eusebius

The exact date when the Gospel was written cannot be determined. There are, however, indications sufficient to help us to fix approximately the time. First, however, it is important to recall what tradition has to say regarding its origin. Clement of Alexandria (circa 150–circa 220 A.D.), as reported by Eusebius,[1] says that "John, perceiving that the external facts had been made plain by the Gospel (the Synoptic account), being urged by his friends, and inspired by the Spirit, composed a spiritual gospel." Eusebius himself, quoting the substance of an existing tradition, writes: "They say that John, who had employed all his time in proclaiming the Gospel orally, finally proceeded to write for the following reason: The three gospels already mentioned having come into the hands of all, and into his own too, they say that he accepted them and bore witness to their truthfulness; but that there was lacking in them an account of the deeds done by Christ at the beginning of his ministry." It is to be noted in passing, that this testimony gives an inadequate impression as to the "supplementary" character of the Gospel, which does indeed supplement the Synoptics, but not only in the way Eu-

[1] *H. E.*, vi, 14; iii, 24.

sebius supposes. The Muratorian Canon (date uncertain, but some time near the beginning of the second century) is more explicit in its witness. "The Fourth Gospel (was written by) John, one of the disciples (i. e., Apostles). When his fellow-disciples and bishop urgently pressed him, he said, 'Fast with me (from) to-day, for three days, and let us tell one another any revelation which may be made to us either for or against (the plan of writing).' On the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John should relate all in his own name and that all should review (his writing)."[1] Muratorian Canon

Irenæus tells us that John lived in Asia until the time of Trajan,[2] and that he published his gospel while staying at Ephesus, in Asia.[3] Here is evidence of a persisting tradition that John wrote his gospel while in Asia. Undoubtedly there are embellishing details which must be subtracted from the account, but the fact that the Gospel was written in Ephesus, in the later years of the Apostle's life, seems adequately attested. The testimony of Irenæus, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, is much more than an isolated statement. It is based upon an experience which reaches back through personal relationship to the Apostle himself. We turn now to mark those indications within the Gospel itself which support this external testimony. Taking smaller matters first, we note Irenæus

A persistent tradition that the Gospel was written in Ephesus

Internal indications of late date

[1] *Muratorian Fragment* (lines 9–16).

[2] Euseb. *H. E.*, iii, 23.

[3] *Ibid.*, v, 8

Evangelist explains Jewish names and customs

that the evangelist explains Jewish names and customs. The other gospels give us such explanations, but in John they are more frequent and particular. The removal of his hearers both in time and space from the scenes of the Lord's ministry would make these explanations very helpful. Examples may be seen in 2: 6; 5: 2; 6: 1, 4; 7: 2, 37; 9: 7; 10:22, 23; 11:18, 55; 12: 1; 18: 28; 19: 14, 17, 31, 42; 21: 1. Again, there are passages which show that he looked back to a time when statements were made which were not then realized, as, for example, that about the Spirit: "The Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified" (7: 39). Such interpretations given from the light of his present experience are found in 12: 33; 18: 32; 19: 36; 21: 19. But these are, after all, minor matters. There are weightier considerations which mark far more clearly the late date of the Gospel. Space forbids the setting forth of more than one or two. One of the notable features of the Gospel is its eschatology. It is well known that the Epistles of Paul look forward to the second coming of the Lord as an event of the near future, and describe its realization in terms which are almost wholly apocalyptical. In the Synoptics Jesus himself had spoken in language which seemed to give warrant to these hopes. It is remarkable how little of this apocalyptical form of expectation is found in the Gospel. Is it not to be explained by the stupendous changes which had come upon Judaism, leaving the horizon clear for that realiza-

Retrospective passages

The eschatology of the Gospel

tion of a spiritual coming upon which the Fourth Gospel lays such emphasis? The destruction of Jerusalem, the opening up of the way to the Gentiles, the essentially spiritual mission of Jesus—did they not open up a vision of a more inward and real coming than apocalyptic forms could convey? "There are no prophecies of the seizure of the Holy City; there is no reiterated promise of a return; the judgment had been wrought. Christ had come."[1] And while it is true that here and there expressions appear which recall the apocalyptic hope of earlier days, it is also true that "the Parousia is taken out of its apocalyptic setting and identified with the return of Christ in that larger spiritual activity on which he had entered through his death."[2] This change of emphasis could come only with time. Events must show that no such speedy, visible return as the early Church longed for, was originally intended by Jesus himself. There must be a process of coming before there could be such issues as apocalyptic forms present to us without historical perspective. How often since the early apostolic age the Church has made the same mistake, and become almost impatient of the slow development of a spiritual kingdom! The thought of Christ's return is as vital to John as it is to Paul and the Synoptics, but it is presented to us in its more spiritual form, due not simply to his own insight, but to the possibility of that fuller un-

[1] Westcott, *Com. on John, Introduc.*, p. xxxviii.
[2] E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 312.

derstanding which the progress of the years and of Christianity gave him. The changes of time throw light upon truth.

The universal character of Christ's mission

Another confirmation of the later date of the Gospel, from the Gospel itself, is seen in the emphasis which appears upon that line of prophecy which has to do with the universal character of Christ's mission. Not only does this come to light in the remembered sayings of Jesus, but the Apostle puts it into interpretations which he himself gives. A notable instance of this is his explanation of the judgment of Caiaphas. The crafty priest had urged the decisive action of the Sanhedrin in the words "it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people." John's comment is that, "he said this not of himself, but being high-priest in that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation, *and not for the nation only, but in order that he might gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad* (11: 57). With force does Westcott say of this, that "When the evangelist wrote these words he was reading the fulfilment of the unconscious prophecy of Caiaphas in the condition of the Christian Church about him."[1] And the difference between him and the Synoptics, as the same author says, is not that they give us no idea of the universalism of the mission of Jesus, but that they neither give it the prominence which it has in the Fourth Gospel, nor trace it back to the same pro-

[1] *Com. on John, Introduc.*, p. xxxvi.

found reason as is exhibited in such sayings as, "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice" (18: 37), and especially in the great central doctrine of the Gospel—the doctrine of eternal life through faith in him. The barriers of race and clime are all down. Jew and Gentile are distinctions lost sight of in the one name Christian. Judgment is upon men as men who turn from the light wherever it comes to them. God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son. Judaism had made its decision. "He came to his own and his own received him not" (1: 11). "Now it is the Saviour of the world" who stands forth in the person of his Master. All this had been gaining new and larger meaning as the writer faced the developments of his later years. The widening vision of experience sent him back to the life and words of Jesus to find in them the larger meaning which his vision called for, and the promised guidance of the Spirit (16: 13) had been given him to just this end.

Some time in the last decade of the first century

Considerations like these second the tradition which assigns the writing of the Gospel to the latter years of John's Ephesian residence. Without presuming to specify the year we are, in the last decade of the first century, sufficiently near the time for our immediate purpose, namely, the study of the influences formative of the Gospel.

Ephesus, its position and character

In order to do this it will be well to get some idea of the position and character of Ephesus at this period. It was the capital of proconsular Asia, a city distinguished for

its trade and commerce, and above all, as the place of the famous temple of Diana. These three facts are really the indices of its life. All that is implied in the term "official residence" characterized this Ionian city. In the wake of its large and flourishing business came wealth, luxury, and grandeur. Its religious importance made its streets familiar with the presence of strangers from all over the then-known world who came to visit its wonderful temple. And it is told us that in A.D. 55 Artemis of Ephesus was the deity "whom all Asia and the civilized world worshipped."

A great centre of heathenism

The city, therefore, was the very centre of heathenism. A lucrative business was carried on in the manufacture of small silver models of the goddess, which travellers took with them not only as objects of worship, but also as a means of protection against evil influences. More interesting for us, however, than the noble temple, the stately streets, the costly homes, and the crowds of heathen worshippers, is the story of its intellectual activity. Here the Greek and Asiatic spirit came into contact. The policy of Alexander to make his conquests centres of Greek civilization was carried out by his successors in all this Western Asia Minor coast. But Hellenism means, as is well known, a conglomerate of various civilizations under the dominance of Greek influence. Greeks, Jews, and native Asiatics were the component parts of the populations of these flourishing cities, and each learned from the other. All comers were given the rights of citizens; even the

Much intellectual activity within its borders

Jews enjoyed this right through the device of the "tribe," by which they were able to keep their own forms of worship. The result was that ease of intercourse which insured a rapid development in commerce, wealth, and culture. In a land, however, where, apart from the Jewish inhabitants, the highest ideals centred about false gods, there was little possibility of great, noble thought. Religious conceptions and philosophic theories were compared, discussed, and modified, but withal the time was devoted to a "rather empty and shallow kind of philosophic speculation." Here also the Greek and the Jew attempted that amalgamation of conceptions with which Alexandria has made us familiar. In a word, the city was the embodiment of a varied, active, restless, superstitious, corrupt life reaching out far and wide beyond its own boundaries; a centre of power and influence of immeasurable importance. It is not strange that Paul turned to it as a point of vantage for the proclamation of his gospel. The length of his stay shows how much store he set by the establishment of Christianity within its borders. Amid perils, against fierce opposition, and with many discouragements, the brave Apostle labored and taught, until not only a church was built up within the city, but also "all they that dwell in Asia heard the word of the Law, both Jews and Greeks." We have only to turn to the letters to the seven churches to discover the temptations and perils which beset the Church in this region of worldly ambitions, moral looseness,

Religions and philosophies compared

Paul turned to it as a great field for work

The letters to seven churches show position of churches in this region

and fertile speculation. As another has tersely said, "The Church's centre of gravity was no longer at Jerusalem; it was not yet at Rome; it *was* at Ephesus." The very situation was in itself an invitation to such an one as John to devote his best energies and maturest thought to the defence and support of the truth and the Church. More was demanded than a recital of the external facts of the earthly ministry. Fanciful speculations, endless genealogies, and ingenious fables had to be met and discredited by essential and abiding principles, by invigorating and ennobling ideals, by a vital, divine, personal reality whose fulness and perfection would satisfy life's profoundest needs and save to the uttermost. Paul had preached all this in his doctrines of the "second man from heaven"; of the exalted and indwelling Christ. John came to tell over the story of redemption in such a way as should show them that in the historical Jesus they were to recognize the eternal Christ who evermore gives life to those who believe in his name. And so "the record moves not on the lines of the ordinary succession of events, so much as on the pathway of ideas: life is manifested under the symbols of water and of bread; truth under the symbol of light. Miracles are signs, and words are the instrument of judgment."[1]

What was demanded in a preacher of the gospel in Ephesus

How the Gospel meets this demand

It is not to be supposed that all this was the outcome of some sudden resolution to write a gospel. That would be

John's growth in spiritual knowledge

[1] J. A. Robinson, *The Study of the Gospels.*

to make the Gospel a creation, rather than an interpretation. Years of living memories lie behind it; memories which had deepened with the enlargement of experience; memories which had been told again and again with ever fresh accessions of insight and grasp of meaning. When we seek, therefore, for the formative influences of the Gospel we are not looking for those which have contributed to the substance of the truth which it contains. Jesus and his teaching are the substance of the Gospel. We are seeking rather to determine, if we may, what influences entered into the experience of the writer to help him to the emphasis which he gives to the "eternal" in Jesus; to lead him to the selection of events which he has made, and to use such forms of expression as shall present his Master most comprehensively to his readers. The dominant purpose of the Gospel of course also exerts a moulding influence upon the whole Gospel. As distinct from this and contributory to its realization, we are now to ask what influences entered into the shaping of the Gospel, making it effective for the exalted purpose which the writer set before him. Three may be noted: (1) The Old Testament. (2) The teaching of Paul. (3) His Ephesian environment.

What is meant by the phrase "formative influences"

1. *The Old Testament*

John was a Jew. The Old Testament Scriptures were to his people the revelation of God, and yet with that

revelation constantly before them, they had rejected Jesus. Was he therefore a contradiction of the Messianic hopes which their holy writings contained? The question brings up the objection to this Gospel that it is anti-Judaic in spirit and tone. Such terms as "the Jews," "your law," "Abraham your father," and such statements as "the hour cometh when ye shall in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father," "Ye are of your father the devil," and "All that came before me are thieves and robbers," are used to prove it. If the proof be valid, then the declaration of Hilgenfeld that the Gospel "breaks every bond between Christianity and its Jewish roots" is true. On the contrary, the distinct aim of all that Jesus says in the various discourses is to set forth the preparatory character of the Old-Testament revelation and the intimate relation between the law, the prophets and himself. "Salvation is of the Jews" (4 : 22). Had they believed Moses they would have believed him, for Moses wrote of him (5 : 46). "These things said Isaiah because he saw Christ's glory and spake of him" (12 : 41—a comment of the evangelist). There is a Judaism and a Judaism brought to light in this Gospel. One, blind, self-sufficient, bound by traditions, and deaf to the spiritual accent of true heavenly teaching, makes every contact with Jesus the occasion of deepening its antagonism, until it at last sets up the cross. The other, holding within its whole course—law and prophets—the promise of a Messiah, and revealing

The Gospel not anti-Judaic in tone

Alleged proofs of its anti-Judaic tone

The real aim of the writer in reference to the Old Testament as seen in the words of Jesus

Two kinds of Judaism

in its history a divine purpose of salvation, comes to its final glorious issue in the full revelation of the Son of God. Westcott's remark is here in point, that "three, and three only, of the old saints, Abraham, Moses and Isaiah, are mentioned by the Lord or by the evangelist in connection with Messiah. These three cover and represent the three successive periods of the training of the people; so subtle and so complete are the harmonies which underlie the surface of the text. Christ claimed for himself testimonies from the patriarchal, the theocratic and the monarchical stages of the life of Israel." But it is not to three names or to three stages of Israel's history that the thought of the evangelist turned in meditating upon what Christ said of the preparation of his people for his coming. Their whole spiritual history was adequately interpreted only in the Word made flesh. He is the key to the Old-Testament Scriptures. It is only superficial unspiritual thinking which at any time affects to think that the law and the prophets are of little worth. Of such thinking John is not guilty. He is alive to the divine that is in them, and while, as other writers of the New Testament, he dwells upon the superiority and glory of the final revelation in Jesus Christ, he has seen, too, the abiding significance of those preparatory scriptures whose meaning cannot be broken.

The sources of the testimonies Christ claimed for himself

Christ the key to the Old Testament

2. *The Teaching of Paul*

Different judgments upon relation of John and Paul

On the relation of John to Paul, critical judgment has come to widely differing conclusions. On one side all conscious relationship between them as far as the Gospel is concerned, is denied; on the other, the Gospel represents an advanced form of Paulinism. "The Fourth Gospel is the effort of a gifted mind to ground the higher Christology of Paul in an interpretation, based on partly independent sources, of the ministry and teaching of Jesus."[1] In some respects the Johannine theology may be considered a little more than the natural development, along one particular line of Paulinism."[2] The whole of the Johannine theology is a natural development from the Pauline."[3] For all of these writers, of course, the Gospel is not a true rescript of history, and John did not write it. As representing the opposite judgment, Sanday says: "As it is, the two great apostolic cycles (Paul and John) stand majestically apart. There may be a connection between them, but it is a connection, in the main, underground. There is no direct application, but the parentage of both lies behind."[4]

Judgment depends upon conception of the historical character of Gospel

As has been suggested, judgment in a measure depends upon one's conception of the historical character of the Gospel. If the discourses are principally constructions

[1] Bacon, *Introduc. to the N. T.*, p. 251.
[2] Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 49.
[3] Wernle. [4] Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel.*

of the evangelist, then the conclusion is not difficult, that similarities of conception are the result of dependence; if not, then affinities must be differently explained. It would be surprising if such an interpretation of Jesus as Paul has given us had made no impression upon one who came into the very region where it had been taught and received. And yet no one can compare the two writers, Paul and John, without realizing how different is their whole method of presentation. The theology of Paul centres about the death and resurrection of his Master; that of John about his incarnation. Neither leaves out that which deeply interests the other, but the emphasis is not the same. Paul is intent upon showing the relation of Christ's death to the law; he cannot be too thankful for "the righteousness of God," revealed and communicated in the propitiatory death of Jesus. The cross is for John the highest proof of the love and grace of God. Justification is one of Paul's great words; the new life "eternal" is for John the inestimable gift of God through Christ. And so we might go on through all the distinctive points of their teaching. If John has borrowed from Paul, he certainly has put upon all that he has taken the stamp of his own genius. The stumbling-block, however, to all this thought of borrowing is that it requires John to so shape the sayings of Jesus as to ascribe to him a truth which originated only with Paul. That might be, if we found in the Gospel simply what Wrede calls a "peri-

Differences in the presentation of John and Paul

patetic God," but the human Jesus of the Fourth Gospel is too consistent with him of the Synoptics to allow this. Where then does the Pauline influence come in? Simply in helping the evangelist to see more clearly the exalted position and work of Jesus. It "bridged the way back" for the memory of John to words of Jesus which became significant in the light of Paul's profound interpretation. A notable instance of this may be found in the testimony of John the Baptist (1:29). Paul's setting forth of the doctrine of the cross is in the sentence, "Who taketh away the sin of the world." So the way was bridged back to those reminiscences in which Jesus speaks of his preëxistence; of his coming to dwell in the hearts of believers; of his laying down his life for the sheep. It certainly is no derogation of the work of the Holy Spirit that through the thought of another the writer of the Gospel came to a profounder sense of the life and words which he had remembered, or that he had them thereby quickened in memory. We have referred to the subjective element in the Gospel. One needs but to run over the comments of the evangelist, and then ask whether this potent influence might not have had its bearing upon them! Back of both Paul and John is Jesus. In the leading points of their interpretation of him there is no disharmony. That is not because one repeats the interpretation of the other, but because they both see the same great reality. Their points of view are not exactly the same, but that is not

Where are we to look for Pauline influence?

Illustrations of possible Pauline influence

to say that in the portrait which John has given us he has not been helped to remember some of its features more distinctly by the vivid portrayal of Paul. To this extent we believe there is a Pauline influence upon the Fourth Gospel. We have called attention to it in various places in the interpretation. It in no way detracts from the value of the Gospel, but rather reveals the influence of two witnesses to the truth. John is not made greater by ignoring Paul. It is only a matter for praise, if Paul's noble work helped his successor to recall more definitely and fully the words which substantiate any true theology of Jesus.

3. *The Ephesian Environment*

By this is meant those elements in the life and thought of the Asian capital which would also in some way condition the form of the presentation of Jesus. The description "Ephesian environment" is not fully satisfactory, as it is not completely exclusive of the point already noted, but it will serve our purpose and become definite as we go on. To dispose of a minor point first, the situation in Ephesus accounts, we believe, for the way by which John the Baptist is introduced into the Gospel. A review of the passages in which he appears will show how intent the evangelist is to distinguish him from his Master. "He was not that light, but came that he might bear witness of the light" (1 : 18). And John the Baptist, himself, when he speaks,

The introduction of John the Baptist into the Gospel

dwells upon his inferiority to Jesus. "He that cometh after me is before me." "He must increase, but I must decrease." In Acts 19 : 1–7 is the account of a group of the disciples of John the Baptist, whom Paul found in Ephesus. Whether they had originally come from Palestine or whether they were, as another supposes, a Gnostic group, their reception into the Church had not completely done away with a Baptist party which was making claims inconsistent with the truth. Carefully the writer of the Gospel avoids any disparagement of John the Baptist, but from the Baptist's own words he seeks to give him his true place and win these, his mistaken adherents, to the full service of Christ.

Disciples of the Baptist in Ephesus

A much more pervasive and potent influence was the speculative activity in this centre of the conflux of religious and philosophic conceptions. The Church was now at least fifty years away from the time of the Lord's death. There was the easy possibility of danger in two directions: either to make religion a matter of tradition with little spiritual power, or try and get a certain permanent value for the actual history of Jesus by sublimating it into a philosophical allegory.[1] This latter danger was peculiarly likely to appear in Ephesus. A permanent value for Jesus was certainly what John was seeking to establish, and at the same time he wished to connect that value with an historical basis. Facts were not to be evapo-

The speculative activity of Ephesus

Two especial dangers to the Church

John seeks to establish permanent value of Jesus

[1] Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 8.

rated into theories; they were rather to reveal the "promise and potency" of that which is abiding. The gospel, the glad tidings of a Saviour, should be so restated that its living force and changeless value would be unmistakable. Nothing seems to us farther from the truth than that it was an attempt to blend Christ's teachings with Greek philosophy. Every student of the more recent criticism of the Gospel knows how often the Logos doctrine of the prologue has been made the proof of just such an attempt. One quotation from a stimulating and richly suggestive work will illustrate this. "Through fellowship with Christ he (the evangelist) had attained to a higher life and a new assurance of God; and he accepts him by a simple judgment of faith as his Lord and Saviour. But he feels it necessary to explain and justify the convictions that have thus been born in him. He has recourse to the speculative forms which the thought of his time afforded, and seeks to express by means of them the purely religious truths of Christianity. The result is that the genuine import of his teaching is to a great extent obscured. We have constantly to disengage it from the alien metaphysic which appears to interpret, but most often warps and conceals it. . . . Jesus revealed the Father because he was identical with the Logos, the eternal principle which, according to current speculation, was the medium of God's activity. His life, therefore, was that of a divine being, self-determined, omniscient, endowed with super-

The Gospel not a conglomerate of Christ's truth and Greek philosophy

natural energies. He revealed God not so much in his moral attributes as in his intrinsic nature. The picture of Jesus which passes before us in the Gospel is everywhere imbued with this conception of him as Logos, and loses in this way much of its reality and attractive power."[1] How blindly the Apostle defeated his own purpose in so setting forth the Son of God that men might believe and have life! As against all this let it be noted (1) that while John did lay hold of this loftiest existing philosophic conception of his time, he immediately showed that he was using it as a form of thought by giving it a meaning which no philosophic system of his day would have acknowledged. "The Logos became flesh." (2) That the content of the term is in line with the development of Jewish conceptions, rather than Alexandrian. (3) That the word is never used in the Gospel outside of the prologue. Godet has with force remarked that "John does not come to invite his readers to a metaphysical walk amid the depths of the divine essence, in order to discover a being called the Logos."[2] And this leads to the further remark that the Gospel itself is in no sense a presentation of the metaphysics of Jesus or of redemption. Its theology is not an expression of any school of philosophy. It is the utterance of a profoundly spiritual nature speaking with "timeless voice to the permanent needs of men." That it suggests metaphysical questions and leads to metaphysical

Three objections to this view

The Gospel does not give us the metaphysics of Jesus

[1] Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 363. [2] *Com. on John* vol. i, p. 383.

dogmas, as men seek to penetrate beyond its spiritual teachings to the understanding of the great realities set forth, is unquestionable. That is a far different matter from saying that it is itself a metaphysical or semi-metaphysical treatise. As Dr. Drummond has well said, "Its philosophical terms are like soft echoes from some lower world, and the whole treatment of them leaves the impression of one who did not belong to the schools, but knew from the society around him the language and the difficulties of the thoughtful men of his time, and sought to answer their questions not by sinking into the wordy dialectics of a sophist, but by taking up current terms and transmitting them with the fire of faith which was more akin to spiritual imagination than to speculative philosophy. . . . The unbelief which is of earth, and cuts men off from God whatever may be their profession, he traces to the unregenerate heart, the false deference to a dead authority, the wishing to agree with the multitude or with the rulers and the learned, the seeking glory from one another and not the glory that comes from God. These are the things that blind men and place them on the wrong side in the great crises of history when individuals and nations are sifted, and the heralds of God sound an alarm to a world buried in spiritual sleep."[1] Because this is all so splendidly true, we need look only to the general situation in Ephesus to understand this influence upon the Gospel. The intricacies

Dr. Drummond's view

Ephesus exerts only a general influence upon the author's method

[1] *Character and Authorship of Fourth Gospel*, p. 25.

and trivialities of varying Gnostic systems are of little moment. It is not true that the writer of the Gospel carries back the hostilities of the latter part of the first century or of the early part of the second. Why should he? The antagonism to Jesus in those days, when the Pharisees and the Sadducees and the people sought to seize him and finally succeeded, is traced to its ultimate reason; and that reason could appear and has appeared again and again with other names and in other lands, for it is in the last analysis unbelief born of moral degradation, intellectual pride, or even spiritual presumption. Over against it stands the Messiah of the Fourth Gospel, speaking with divine accents, living a life unspotted and calling men everywhere to repent from sin, to love God and accept eternal life. He talks no metaphysics; he needs no philosophy to explain him. Through loving obedience issuing in spiritual-mindedness can he be known. So John came to know him, and with the growth of the years and the experiences of life, to see the deeper eternal meaning of his Master.

The oppositions are fundamental, not merely temporal

> "Much that at first, in deed and word
> Lay simply and sufficiently exposed,
> Had grown (or else my soul was grown to match,
> Fed through such years, familiar with such light,
> Guarded and guided still to see and speak)
> Of new significance and fresh result;
> What first were guessed as points I now knew stars."

IV

THE APOSTLE JOHN

Identifying, as we have, the unnamed and beloved disciple of the Fourth Gospel with the Apostle John, the account of what little we have given regarding him in the Scriptures begins with the time when he was a disciple of John the Baptist. The trumpet call of this last of the prophets had brought him either from Jerusalem or from the shores of Galilee, and he had given himself to the service of quickening the nation to repentance. A vein in John's character made him earnestly responsive to the stern, uncompromising message of the Baptist, and he doubtless joined in the preaching which should convict the nation of its sin. How long he had been in this service when Jesus first appeared at the Jordan we do not know, but that memorable day came, and he heard the wondrous testimony of his teacher, "Behold the Lamb of God!" (Jn 1:36). With eager attention he and Andrew listened to Jesus as he spoke that day; and, unwilling to miss a word, they followed him as he moved about among the people. Their deepening interest caught the eye of Jesus, and he asked them what they were seeking. Their counter-question indicates their keen desire to know more about him, and in response to the inquiry as to where he was abiding, Jesus

At first a disciple of the Baptist

He meets Jesus by the Jordan

gave them an invitation to go with him and see (Jn. 1:37–39). So vividly was the time of that eventful invitation impressed upon John's mind—four o'clock in the afternoon —that he never forgot it. It was really a crisis hour in his life (1:39) for he came from that brief visit with the conviction that he had found the Messiah. It matters not that neither of the two who went to the abode of Jesus understood fully what they meant by the word "Messiah." They knew enough to bring about a change in the current of their lives. John's home was in Galilee (probably at Bethsaida). Zebedee, his father, was apparently a man of some property (Mk. 1:20), and followed the business of fishing in the lake. The fisheries of the sea of Galilee were at this time an important and flourishing industry. No less than three cities on the shore derived their names from the business—Tarichaea, Bethsaida and Chorazin. At the time of the great feasts in Jerusalem there was a large demand for fish, and the business was profitable. A law of the land, supposed to date from the time of Joshua, prevented any monopolization of the fishing grounds. It may have been, as has been suggested, that in connection with this business John was frequently called to Jerusalem, and hence was well known in the capital. Furthermore, the fact that he lived in Galilee is no argument against the supposition that he may have been related to some of the nobility in Jerusalem. His mother's name was Salome. (Compare Matt. 27:56 with Mk. 15:40.) On the next

He goes to the abode of Jesus; a crisis hour for him

John's home and his father's business

His mother

day after their memorable visit with him, Jesus set out for Galilee, and his new disciples accompanied him on their way home. What occurred on the way is recorded in Jn. 1:43–51. Invited to attend a wedding in Cana, to which his mother had gone, Jesus arrived with his followers, and there they witnessed the beginning of that miraculous activity, which made peculiar appeal to the faith of Jews (Jn. 2:1–11). The time was drawing near for the annual feast of the Passover. Jesus planned to visit this feast and open his public ministry in the capital. At Capernaum they could easily join one of the caravans moving southward, so they went thither (Jn. 2:12). Now for the first time Jesus entered the Temple city in the full consciousness of his Messiahship, and John witnessed that startling deed, the cleansing of the Temple (Jn. 2:13–22). This was followed by a number of miracles performed in the city, which aroused popular interest and curiosity. Not only the people, but the rulers were deeply stirred by this doer of wonders, who was at the same time proclaiming the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven; and John was permitted to hear the conversation of his Master with Nicodemus, one of the Jewish rulers, who came to make inquiry regarding the new doctrine (Jn. 3:1–15). The capital had not shown itself ready for a favoring reception of Jesus, so he withdrew into the country districts of Judea, and continued there the work of preparation (Jn. 3:22). John the Baptist was then baptizing at

He accompanies Jesus to Galilee; attends wedding at Cana

Goes with him to Jerusalem to Passover

Hears conversation with Nicodemus

Ænon, and the work of the two preachers was naturally confused, though Jesus himself did not baptize. It was at this time that the dispute arose between the disciples of Jesus and John the Baptist, and the Baptist bore his noble testimony to the place and prerogatives of Jesus (Jn. 3: 22–30). Owing to the suspicion of the Pharisees, Jesus left Judea and returned by way of Samaria to Galilee. On the way occurred that memorable scene by the well of Samaria, at which John was present (Jn. 4:1–42) On his arrival in Galilee Jesus went again to Cana, and here John saw "the second sign which Jesus did, having come out of Judea into Galilee," the cure of the nobleman's son (Jn. 4:46–54). John now returned to his home for a while, and engaged in the business of fishing. The imprisonment of John the Baptist soon again called him to the side of his Master, who saw in the confinement of his herald the sign that he must enter at once vigorously upon his mission (Mk. 1:16–20; Matt. 4:18–22; Lk. 5:1–11). With this call begins the second stage of John's discipleship, and all we know of it is involved in the record of the teaching and general activity of Jesus. It was all a part of the training which he, with the other disciples, was to have for the arduous work later to be put upon them (see Mk. 1:21; 2:22). Later came the choice to the apostolate, and his mission in life was fully defined (Mk. 3:13–19; Matt. 10:2–4; Lk. 6:12–19). Mark tells us that at the time of this call he named James and John

Is with him at the well in Samaria

At home again for a short time

Second stage of discipleship begins with call at lake-side

Later chosen apostle and called "son of thunder"

"sons of thunder" (Mk. 3:17) or, as the term is otherwise interpreted, "sons of tumult," "angry men"—a description which points to a trait in the "beloved disciple" which is often overlooked. It comes out in the incident in regard to the Samaritan village, when these two disciples wished to call down fire from heaven upon the inhospitable Samaritans (Lk. 9:54). To write out the account of the Apostle's experience from this point onward would be virtually to repeat the story of the gospels. John was in constant attendance upon his Master, and shared with his companion apostles all the vicissitudes of the life of journeying, preaching, and service. Some incidents in which John was especially favored may be noted as showing the fact that he was a "beloved disciple." At the raising of Jairus's daughter Jesus took only Peter and James and John into the room of death (Mk. 5:37; Lk. 8:51). These three were with him on the Mount of Transfiguration (Mk. 9:2; Matt. 19:1; Lk. 9:28). As reflecting something of the "straight" orthodoxy which appears in the First Epistle is the incident recorded in Mark 9:38 and Luke 9:44, where he forbade a man who was casting out devils, because he was following Jesus. That he had not entered into the true meaning of the Messiahship of Jesus is seen in his ambitious request given in Mk. 10:37, Matt. 20:21. It was he who asked Jesus privately about the fulfilment of the great prophecies concerning Jerusalem. There can be no mistake, therefore, in that

John now in constant attendance upon his Master

Especial privileges accorded him

more spiritual understanding of eschatology which came to him after Jerusalem was destroyed. During Passion week he was commissioned with Peter to make preparation for the passover (Lk. 22:8); he reclined near Jesus at the supper, and asked him confidential questions (Jn. 13:23–25); in the garden he was near his agonized Master (Mk. 14:33) and, though in the first moments of panic over the arrest he fled with the others (Matt. 26:56), he soon recovered himself, and followed the procession to the palace of the high-priest (Jn. 18:15). His relationship to Jerusalem gave him the privilege of entrance, and from him we learn much of the inner progress of the whole travesty upon justice in the various court scenes. His fearless love took him to Calvary, and there he received from the dying lips of Jesus the command to care for Mary (Jn. 19:26, 27). From Mary Magdalene he hears of the resurrection, and he hastens with Peter to the grave (Jn. 20:2, 3). Once more we hear of him in connection with the appearance of the risen Lord in Galilee (Jn. 21:2–7). and there the record of him as far as the Gospels are concerned comes to an end. It is withal a meagre account, but in what it suggests it is pregnant with a wonderful experience. The numerous touches in the Fourth Gospel, which argue an eye-witness of its scenes, accord with this record of intimacy with Jesus.

The Gospel account of him but meagre

His later history

The later history of the Apostle can be known only from a very few references. In the Acts we hear of him

in connection with a miracle wrought at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, as he and Peter were going up thither at the hour of prayer (Acts 3:4). The excitement over the event caused his arrest and appearance before the Sanhedrin. Later he and Peter were sent to Samaria to further the work of Philip (8:14, 15), and Paul speaks of him as being in Jerusalem about A.D. 50 (Gal. 2:1, 9). At that time he was recognized as one of the pillars of the Church (Gal. 2:9).

Goes to Samaria

From this time on our knowledge of him is gained entirely from the traditions of the Church. According to this source he is said to have remained in Jerusalem until the death of Mary, in A.D. 48. The time of his departure from Jerusalem is entirely uncertain. He probably left the city, as did all the other Christians, before its destruction in A.D. 70. We have already seen why he would be attracted to Ephesus, where tradition declares that he spent the later years of his life. The importance of the city and the needs of the Church made earnest appeals for help. As, however, the Ephesian residence of John is vigorously disputed, it is in order here to review the evidence and see whether we are justified in accepting the generally received conclusion. Irenæus, Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, and Clement of Alexandria are the main witnesses for the common tradition. The first is very explicit, telling us that John, the disciple of the Lord, who also lay on his breast, likewise published the Gospel,

Further knowledge only from tradition

Uncertain when he left Jerusalem; goes to Ephesus

Ephesian residence disputed

Three main witnesses for it

Irenæus

while dwelling at Ephesus.[1] "The Church at Ephesus founded by Paul, and with which John lived till Trajan's time (98–117 A.D.), is a truthful witness to the traditions of the apostles."[2]

We have already noted (chap. i, pp. 15–17) the close relationship in life and experience of Irenæus, Polycarp, and John. Their united lives bridge over a whole century of personal associations and reverent memories and the witness which they bear to John's residence in Ephesus seems well-nigh conclusive. Two considerations, however, have been urged against it. These are (1) the silence among older writers regarding the Ephesian residence and (2) the possible confusion on the part of Irenæus of John the Apostle with John the Presbyter. By "older writers" are meant Polycarp and Ignatius. There is no sufficient reason why Polycarp in his letter to the *Philippians* should mention John, but it does at first sight seem strange that Ignatius in his Epistle to the *Ephesians* should have no reference to him. His mention of Paul is called out by the fact that just as the Apostle had received the elders at Miletus on his way to imprisonment in Rome, so he received at Smyrna a delegation from Ephesus.[3] The argument from silence is by no means conclusive, seeing that even Paul is mentioned only by reason of especial circumstances. Furthermore, in the immediately preceding chapter he asks their prayers, "that he may be found in the lot of the Christians of

Considerations urged against Ephesian residence

Ignatius

Value of the argument from silence

[1] *Contra Haer.*, iii, 1, 1. [2] Ibid., iii, 3, 4. [3] *Epis. to Ephes.*, § 12.

Ephesus who have always been of the same mind with the *apostles*, through the power of Jesus Christ." In connection with other evidence, there is certainly more reason to include John here among the apostles than to leave him out. "When one takes into account the scantiness of the literary remains of this early period, the probable growth of John's reputation during the second century and the prevalence in the Ignatian epistles themselves of a Johannine type of teaching [1] the argument from silence loses much of its force."[2]

In writing of the external evidence (see previous chapter) attention was called to the extreme unlikelihood of the confusion of John the Apostle with John the Presbyter. We must now give attention to the statement of Eusebius,[3] that Papias has not declared that he himself was hearer and eye-witness of the holy apostles. The testimony of Papias is: "But I shall not hesitate also to put down for you along with my interpretations whatsoever things I have at any time learned carefully from the elders and carefully remembered, guaranteeing their truth. For I did not, like the multitude, take pleasure in those that speak much, but in those that teach the truth; not in those that relate strange commandments, but in those that deliver the commandments given by the Lord to faith

The witness of Papias

[1] See Von der Goltz's *Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe in Texte und Untersuchungen*, Band XII.

[2] "John the Apostle" in *Dict. of Christ and the Apostles* (Riggs).

[3] *H. E.*, iii, 39.

and springing from the truth itself. If then any one came who had been a follower of the elders I questioned him in regard to the words of the elders—what Andrew or what Peter said, or what was *said* by Philip, or by Thomas, or by James, or by John, or by Matthew, or by any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what things Aristion and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, *say*. For I did not think that what was to be gathered from the books would profit me as much as what came from the living and abiding voice." [1]

Points in this witness requiring examination

Two points in this witness require examination: (1) The distinction between the Apostle John and the Presbyter John. (2) The distinction in the tenses of the verb, "said," "say." In regard to the first, there seems to be little doubt that the reference is to two distinct persons. In regard to the second, the explanation given by Drummond seems most satisfactory.[2] In his search for enlightenment Papias inquired after the unwritten sayings of all referred to, except Aristion and John the Presbyter. In their case he was getting information from "*books*." The "what they say," refers to the time of writing, not to the time of inquiry, and "the books" to words written by some other authors, but entitled perhaps, "Narratives of Aristion," "Traditions of the Presbyter John." These books, being anonymous, needed confirmation by com-

There are two Johns

Drummond's explanation of the change of tenses

[1] *H. E.*, iii, 39.

[2] *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 199–204.

petent witnesses. Hence, what Papias would say is that he gained what information he could from the unwritten sayings of the Apostles and from the written sayings of Aristion and the Presbyter. "No matter what the Apostles had written, any authentic additions to their teachings would be welcome. But if these were books professing to contain sayings of Aristion and John the Presbyter, Papias might well allege as a reason for inquiring into those sayings that he did not feel as much confidence in the books as in the oral reports." [1] If this interpretation be correct, then Papias was not a hearer of even the Presbyter John, as far as this piece of evidence goes. Irenæus got his information about Papias's hearing the Apostle from other sources and Eusebius. Inasmuch as he adduces no more explicit statement than the above, it cannot prove a confusion of persons. Certainly the passage does not require us to think that the Presbyter John was in Ephesus at all. Dionysius of Alexandria is the authority for this last fact. He is arguing for the authorship of the Apocalypse by some other John than the Apostle, and cites the tradition that "there are two monuments in Ephesus, each bearing the name of John."[2]

Dionysius of Alexandria cited for two Johns in Asia

It has been well said "that the existence of two memorials in Ephesus such as Dionysius, Eusebius, and Jerome refer to, by no means proves that more than one John was buried there." Over against all this, we

Value of the testimony

[1] Drummond, *ibid.*, p. 201.

[2] Eus. *H. E.*, vii, 25.

must once more emphasize the position and relationship of Irenæus.

How the witness of Polycrates is attacked

In much the same way an attempt is made to weaken the witness of Polycrates by showing from his alleged confusion of the Apostle and the evangelist Philip the like possibility in regard to the Apostle and the Presbyter. Even if it were indisputable that the two Philips had been confused, the fact would constitute no valid argument for a confusion of the two Johns. Each must be examined on its own grounds. And it is by no means sure that Polycrates has made a mistake in regard to Philip. Dr. Drummond, after an examination of the argument, concludes that Polycrates is correct. We are, however, concerned with his testimony to John. And first, we must call attention to the position of Polycrates. He was Bishop of Ephesus, and when he wrote his letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome, was old enough to have been living at the time of Polycarp. Here again we have continuity of experiences adding its support to testimony. He tells us that John, who was both a witness and a teacher, who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord, being a priest wore the sacerdotal plate. He fell asleep at Ephesus.[1] The description "who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord" points directly to the Apostle. What is said regarding the sacerdotal plate is likewise said of James,[2] the Lord's brother, and is probably nothing more than a figurative expression for

The position of Polycrates as affecting the trustworthiness of his knowledge

[1] Eus. *H. E.*, iii, 31; v, 24. [2] Epiphanius, *Haer.*, lxxvii, 14.

the exalted position which these men held among their Christian brethren. In Polycrates, a contemporary of Irenæus, we have an independent witness.

Clement of Alexandria

As introductory to the witness of Clement of Alexandria, it is well to note what he says in reference to his "Miscellanies": "This work is not a writing artfully constructed for display; but my notes are stored up for old age as a remedy against forgetfulness." He tells us the order and nationality of his teachers, that we may know that "these men preserved the tradition of doctrine directly from the holy Apostles, Peter, James, John, and Paul, son receiving it from father—though few were like their fathers—until by God's will the seeds of truth from ancestors and Apostles came to them." [1] It is in his story of John and the young disciple who became a robber that Clement bears his witness to John's residence in Ephesus, [2] and because Clement seems to offer a distinct line of tradition, his witness is an independent confirmation of Irenæus and Polycrates.[3]

His reference to a line of tradition directly from Peter, James, John, and Paul

It is upon this body of testimony that the Ephesian residence of John has been thought to rest securely. It seems clear, adequate, and satisfactory.

We can only imagine the life of the aging Apostle as he talked and worked in this busy centre of Græco-Oriental life. The needs of the work were such as to demand his

[1] *Stromata*, i, 1. [2] Eus. *H. E.*, iii, 23.
[3] See Drummond, *Character and Authorship*, p. 213.

fullest energies, and the Gospel is our evidence for the exalted character of his teaching.

John's exile in Patmos

No sketch of the Apostle's life were complete without some reference to his alleged banishment to the island of Patmos. The statement in Revelation 1:9 is probably

Weiss's and Ramsay's views

the basis for the tradition of his exile. Weiss supposes that he went thither to find a religious retreat; Ramsay[1] thinks that his banishment was attended with great hardship and suffering. Certainly the tradition that he was an exile on this lonely island is widely attested. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, all speak of it. Whether the experience was bitter or not, he came back to Ephesus to end his long and blessed life. At least, such has been the generally accepted faith

View that John was slain by the Jews

of the Church. That belief, however, has of late been questioned, owing to the witness of two authorities[2] to the statement of Papias that John was put to death by the Jews. Sanday[3] places the death of the Apostle among the unsolved problems connected with the Gospel. It is strange, if John died a violent death at the time of his brother, that Eusebius ignores the fact. Perhaps the most plausible explanation of the matter is that a mistaken interpretation of μαρτυρῶν which in its earlier sense did

[1] *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 85.

[2] *The Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolos* (ninth century) and the *DeBoor Fragment*.

[3] *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 251.

not mean death, supported the desire to find a fulfilment of Mark 10: 38–39.

John's character

Brief as this outline is, yet with the help of the Gospel and the First Epistle, we may get a fairly just estimate of the great Apostle's character. One's first thought of him is that he was quiet, meditative, of a reflective type of character. All this he undoubtedly was, but there was another side. He could flash up in a moment, and we see him at times when he is intolerant. Certainly he was ambitious. He could love passionately, and hate intensely. Fortunately the discipline of truth turned his hatred toward that which was untrue and unrighteous. The sharp, straight sentences of the First Epistle tell us how he felt toward the wickedness of the world. The emphasis which both the Epistle and the Gospel put upon the love of God revealed in his Master, tell us how deeply he felt the mercy of redemption. Tender, strong, courageous, uncompromising, such was he who while a "son of tumult" was yet "the beloved disciple."

THE PROLOGUE: THE BEGINNINGS OF THE HISTORY

IN THESE BEGINNINGS WE HAVE SET BEFORE US THE SPIRITUAL FORCES WHICH WORK ON THROUGH THE GOSPEL, BRINGING OUT, EACH IN ITS OWN WAY, THE REVELATION OF THE MESSIAH

THE PROLOGUE

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE HISTORY

I

Its Representative Character

Purpose of the prologue

The first eighteen verses of the Gospel constitute an introduction, or, as it is usually called, a prologue. This prologue sets forth the realities which underlie and condition the history given us in the Gospel itself. It presents to us the central figure of the succeeding drama in his relations both to God and to men and the attitude of men toward him. It gives us the *motifs*, to use a musical phrase, of all the interplay of forces evident in the scenes of the history. For this reason the prologue is a summary as well as an introduction. A study of the Gospel will show that the first eighteen verses do but gather up into compact form all that has been learned. Their pithy sentences are the outcome of the author's reflection upon all he has seen and heard in Galilee and Jerusalem. Hence, the prologue may be called the Gospel in miniature. The chapters containing inci-

Gospel in miniature

dent and discourse are simply an analysis or illustration of its comprehensive statements. It is true that the epithet "the Word" does not occur outside of these introductory verses, but each chapter contributes its share toward the make-up of this peculiar and pregnant description of the Messiah. They that were "his own received him not." How complete a summary that is of the sleepless espionage of the ecclesiastical authorities, the wilful misinterpretations of the Pharisees, the sharply chilled enthusiasms of the people, and the final cruel injustice of Calvary itself! And what are miracle and teaching and sinless conduct but means toward helping us see "the glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth"? That this close interrelation between introduction and Gospel may be more evident note the following parallels:

Parallels between prologue and Gospel

In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God.	Before Abraham was, I am (8:58).
	Glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was (17:5).
And the Word was God.	This made the Jews all the more eager to kill him, because not only was he

doing away with the Sabbath, but he actually called God his own Father, putting himself on an equality with God (5: 18; 10: 32).

Thou art my Lord and my God (20: 28).

All things were made through him, and without him was nothing made which has come to be.

My Father has gone on working to the present moment, I go on working too (5: 17).

In him was life.

I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly (John 10: 10; 5: 21; 11: 25, 26).

And the life was the light of men.

I am the light of the world (9: 5).

And the light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness apprehended it not.

And this is the judgment, that the light is come into the world and men loved the darkness rather than the light, for their works were evil (3: 19; 12: 46).

There came a man, sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness that he

And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the son of God (1: 34).

might bear witness of the light, that all might believe through him.

He was not the light, but came that he might bear witness of the light.

And he confessed, I am not the Christ (1:20).

Ye yourselves bear me witness that I said I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before him (3:28).

There was the true light, even the light which lighteth every man coming into the world.

He was in the world and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.

He came to his own, and they that were his own received him not.

He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life (8:12).

The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it that its works are evil (7:7; 15:18; 16:9).

I know that ye are Abraham's seed; yet ye seek to kill me because my word hath not free course in you (8:37).

From that day forth they took counsel that they might put him to death (11:53).

See also 7: 1, 5, 12, 20; 15: 25.

But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born not of blood nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God (3: 5).

See 6: 65; 14: 6.

And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us.

I came out from the Father and am come into the world (16: 28).

For the words which thou gavest me I have given unto them, and they received them and knew of a truth that I came forth from thee, and they believed that thou didst send me (17: 8).

And we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.

And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God (6: 69).

I glorified thee in the earth, having accom-

John beareth witness of him and crieth, saying: This was he of whom I said, He that cometh after me is become before me; for he was before me.

For of his fulness we all received, and grace for grace.

For the law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

plished the work which thou gavest me to do (17:4).

Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world! This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is before me, for he was before me (1:29, 30).

He that cometh to me shall not hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst (6:35).

I am the way and the truth and the life (14:6).

To this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth (18:37).

He that hath seen me hath seen the Father (14:9).

The Father that sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak (12:49).

This parallelism makes several facts evident: (1) That the prologue is not a mere speculative introduction to the Gospel. Its purpose is in no sense metaphysical. Every sentence is linked with practical issues. No statement transcends the teaching of Jesus himself. Each, rather, is framed from a clear conception of the import of the Master's own utterances or from a profound understanding of the issues which *in history* attended the supreme revelation of the Son. The time has gone by when John's Gospel can be justly called a philosophic or theological romance. The reality of history is in it, and the prologue is, in its general statements, a clear, faithful reflection of that reality. Without the words, deeds, and sufferings of Jesus it never could have been written. The Jewish speculative philosophy of Alexandria would have repudiated it, for the simple reason that it could not follow "the Word" here spoken of along the paths of incarnate being and suffering. Of course it may be said that the very point at issue is here assumed, namely, that the facts of the Gospel are *facts*, and that the discourses are genuine and not "variations of the speculative theme placed at the beginning of the book." Both of these positive positions must have attention and confirmation, as we go on through the interpretation of the Gospel. It is sufficient now to say that the facts of the narrative have every mark of historicity, and the discourses, whatever

Prologue not a speculative introduction

may be their relation to Jesus or to John, are certainly not speculative constructions in support of a Logos theorem.

Prologue substance of the history

(2) That the three leading ideas of the prologue are the substance respectively of the three facts developed simultaneously in the history. These three facts are: The Messiahship of Jesus, the blind and pitiful rejection of him by the Jews, and the response made to him in faith by those whose spiritual desires or whose sense of need caused them to listen to his gracious message. As the story unfolds we come to see even more clearly how fully Jesus has interpreted to us the holiness and love of God, and by this very interpretation shown himself to be the Messiah. We also can watch the deepening antagonism of the capital, and note as well the answer to his call of those who "knew his voice."

II

THE PROLOGUE (1:1–18)

Relation of the Word to God and creation (1–4)

He who has been to us the Revealer of God has existed from all eternity in communion with God, and is himself essentially divine. He is so identified with God in reference to creation that it is possible to say that all things without exception came into being through his coöperation.

Creation itself has the stamp of the Messiah upon it.

Not one thing apart from his presence ever came into being. All animate things get life from him, and to such beings as possess rational intelligence, that is, to men, the life that was in him became light or truth which is the life of the soul. Even now this truth, as light, is shining for the blessing of men, but they have been unwilling to receive it. They have preferred the darkness of selfishness. Mark how they have done it. John the Baptist, sent from God, and the last of a long line of prophets who in their time bore witness to this "light of life," suffered the fate of those prophets. He came to bear specific witness to this light-truth as embodied in Jesus. Although he was himself a "burning and shining lamp," he was but a lamp, not the true light,[1] and the single, great purpose of all his activity was that men, irrespective of class or condition, might receive the truth as it is in Jesus. From his prophetic warnings and heart-searching appeals men turned contemptuously away. The "darkness" did not apprehend the "light." Just what happened in Israel took place in the world at large. This light of life—the essential, archetypal light, which

To men who do not believe (5–11)

[1] It is not unlikely that the careful distinction made between the Baptist and Christ may have been called out by assertions of a Baptist party existing at Ephesus at the time of John's teaching (see Acts 18: 25; 19: 3, 4). In the Clementine Recognition (perhaps from first half of third century) it is said that "some of the disciples of John, who seemed to be great ones, have separated themselves and proclaimed their own master as the Christ" (1: 54). It will be noted that while holding dear the superiority of Jesus to John, the Gospel gives full recognition to the exalted position of the Baptist.

shines in every man's soul in the illumination of conscience, has been ever coming into the world in those experiences which are meant to teach men the moral significance of life—in a sense of need or of guilt, in mercies or judgments. Yes, from the beginning this light has been in the world shining through all its ordered glory, and yet the world has, with all its intellectual keenness and philosophic insight, not seen it. Heathen worship and philosophy have been as darkness, which darkness did not apprehend the light. And when at last in personal, human revelation, he came to his own peculiar possession—the people of Israel—what did they do but reject him!

To those who believe (12–16)

Were this all that could be said, the world were dark indeed, but the issue has not been wholly calamitous, the witness has not been altogether fruitless. While the nation as a whole refused to receive the Christ, as many as did receive him by faith had given to them the right of becoming God's children—a relationship which springs neither from human parenthood nor hereditary privilege, but solely and wholly from the regenerating power of God himself. And the reason of this glorious outcome of faith in him is that he who had revealed God in various ways in the world's history became man, conjoining the divine and human in one personality; and as the Shekinah dwelt within the Tabernacle of old, so he tabernacled here on earth. Then we looked upon his glory, and it was as the glory of an only son who has come from a father—ab-

solutely without parallel in its perfect revelation to us of the character of God. In him we saw a complete embodiment of redeeming love and saving truth. Even yet is echoing the witness of John the Baptist, who said, "He who cometh after me has come to be my Master, for the very reason that from the beginning he was more exalted than I, being the Son of God." And we have no better proof that all the fulness of divine love and reality was in him than this, that we have all received out of this fulness blessing after blessing in ever-enlarging measure. Is not this same fulness made evident also in the contrast between that for which the names of Moses and Jesus Christ stand? The Law, that divine bestowment which sets forth ideals of righteousness, demands obedience, and threatens penalty, was *given* through Moses, but in the *very coming* of Jesus Christ came the revelation of the way to attain to righteousness, the inspiration and power to make the law an inward principle and deliverance from the bondage of externalism of every kind. When one asks why this fulness all came through Jesus Christ we must simply mark again his relation to God. Only he who has seen God in the intimacy of personal, unhindered communion can make him fully known. That no man ever did until the man Christ Jesus came. He, from the depths of his insight and from the fellowship of his unparalleled sonship, has interpreted the Father.

Contrast between Moses or the Law, and Christ or the Gospel (17)

Christ's full interpretation of the Father (18)

III

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE HISTORY

Where John's narrative begins and why

It is the purpose of this Gospel, as we have already seen, to lead men to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the son of God, and through that faith to gain eternal life. Consistent with this purpose, John does not begin his account of Jesus until after the Temptation. A moment's reflection will show why. It was at the Baptism that Jesus came to the full, clear consciousness of his mission. In that significant hour he was equipped with power for service (Luke 4: 1), and in the word, "Thou art my beloved son, in thee I am well pleased" (Mk. 1: 11) he heard the confirmation of all his hopes, questionings, and longings—he *was* the Messiah. The weighty, solemn problems of his exalted position called for retirement and meditation. Then came the Temptation. It is worthy of note that this critical period in the Master's life is put by all the Synoptics immediately after the Baptism. It could have come at no earlier time, for the Temptation is no mere model for Christian conduct in the hour of seduction to evil. It is all that and vastly more, even the settlement of the way by which Messiahship should be realized and manifested. The Baptism and the Temptation are, therefore, of profound

significance in the life of Jesus. He comes from them as the Messiah—proclaimed, tried, triumphant—the very Messiah whom John wishes us to see. He steps out into the light of public service; and every deed, as well as every word, is to make him indisputable in claim and supremely worthy of acceptance. The marvels that surrounded his birth and the glimpse into his boyhood life are of no moment to John. These do not contribute essentially to his purpose. He begins when the great central figure, who fills all his thought, has come upon the stage. From the very first we must see Jesus who is *the Christ.* Mark now how graphically the account opens. The last word of the prologue has hardly finished its impress upon the memory when the drama begins whose scenes are to show us how, and with what success, the only begotten Son interpreted the Father; nay, more than this, to show us the only begotten Son as the interpreter of the Father. To continue the figure which John's graphic method suggests, the rolling up of the curtain reveals to us all the typical factors of the tragedy which is to be enacted—John the Baptist, the Jews, disciples, and Jesus himself. We begin our study of the history with that grouping of these factors which comes from the testimonies of the Baptist and the personal influence of Jesus.

IV

THE TESTIMONIES OF THE BAPTIST (1:19–42)

1. *First Testimony to the Deputation Sent Down from Jerusalem* (1:19–28)

The wide-spread interest in a prophet's voice (19)

The vigorous, earnest, fearless preaching of John had drawn multitudes to him and caused a wide-spread sensation. It was something new in Israel to hear again a prophet's voice. The ringing tones of the Baptist broke upon a silence of four centuries and the call, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," quickened eager hopes and awakened earnest questionings. It was the business of the sanhedrin, the Jewish supreme court in Jerusalem, to keep a watchful eye upon all matters affecting the religious welfare of the nation. The claims of any would-be religious leader and the orthodoxy of his teachings must satisfy this august body if he was not to feel the power and constancy of its opposition. Hence the delegation of priests and Levites from Jerusalem. It had two questions to ask: "Who are you?" and "Why do you baptize?" There had been considerable discussion among the people as to whether John the Baptist were the Messiah (Lk. 3:15). Therefore, their first inquiry, "Art thou the Christ?" to which John gave a quick and decisive answer, "I am not the Messiah." Unless he were an impostor,

John's reply to the committee from Jerusalem (20–27)

only two possibilities remained: Either he must be Elijah, who, according to the teaching of the scribes, on the basis of Malachi 4: 5, would be the forerunner of the day of the Lord, or else that ancient prophet, be it Jeremiah or some other, who was, according to Deuteronomy 18: 15, to come and who by some was distinguished from the Messiah (Jn. 7: 40, 41), by others confused with him (Jn. 6: 14; Matt. 16 : 13, 14). As their expectations involved a bodily return of these ancient worthies, John promptly replied that he was neither Elijah nor the prophet. A merely negative answer, however, would not satisfy the Jerusalem authorities, and upon being pressed for a positive declaration, the Baptist described himself in the language of Isaiah (40 : 3), and with notable self-effacement as

> "A voice crying in the wilderness,
> Straighten the way of the Lord."

Immediately, then, came the question, "Why, if thou art neither the Christ nor Elijah, art thou baptizing?" The Pharisees were represented in this delegation, and they wished particularly to know what right he had to treat Israelites as if they were proselytes. According to tradition, the purification of the people was to be one of the acts initiating the kingdom, but that purification was to be accomplished either by the Messiah or by his forerunner. The Baptist's answer to this question has been often misunderstood. He does not justify his action by emphasizing

an antithesis between "baptizing with water" and "baptizing with the Spirit." That comes in the witness of the next day. His answer is virtually this: The *situation* justifies me, since now in your midst stands one whom you do not know. I know him and he is the one who cometh after me. So exalted is he in character and station that I am not worthy to do even the menial service of undoing his shoe. My baptism with water is a solemn preparation for him.

Place of testimony (28)

This first testimony to the Messiah was given in Bethany, on the eastern side of the Jordan.

2. *Second Testimony: To the Multitude upon the First Public Appearance of Jesus as the Messiah* (1:29–34)

Jesus comes to John the Baptist (29)

Immediately after his baptism Jesus sought privacy that he might, alone with God, consider the duties and claims of his divine mission (Lk. 4:1). As has been already said, it was a time of temptation and of triumph. When he was ready to return to the world, he naturally turned to John, for around him he would find receptive spirits for his message. And it happened that he came to the place of the Baptist's activity on the next day after the departure of the deputation from Jerusalem. These days are all distinctly remembered, for it was on that never-to-be-forgotten third day that "one of the two who heard

John and followed Jesus" (40), came to the faith which gave him a Saviour and made the writing of this Gospel possible. The Baptist saw Jesus coming, and immediately exclaimed, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!"

Does the last clause of John the Baptist's witness belong to him?

Two questions at once present themselves in regard to this witness: (1) Is the latter half of it an interpretation put into the mouth of the Baptist by the evangelist? (2) To what lamb is reference made by the explicit expression *the Lamb*?

The brief summary of the Baptist's preaching given in the Synoptics shows us that his thought of the Messiah's work was almost entirely one of judgment. "He shall come with fan in hand to cleanse his threshing-floor, and he will gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire" (Matt. 3: 12). This message suited well the stern, uncompromising character of the messenger. To a certain extent John was a man of his time. His spiritual earnestness did not save him entirely from sharing that popular vision of glorious issues when judgment should end in triumph. It was the commixture of his conception with all he had taught which led him in the trying days of his imprisonment to send to Jesus to ask him if he were really the Messiah (Matt. 11: 3).

When Jesus came to the Baptism the quiet dignity

and moral majesty of his presence overawed this stern prophet of the wilderness. There was no outward symbol of fierce judgment in his hand. He came with all gentleness and meekness, and John knew too well the perversity of Israel to believe that this meek and gentle spirit could meet with anything else than suffering and insult. The picture in Isaiah's well-known description of the "Servant of God" flashed upon his mind, and in the exclamation, "Behold the Lamb of God," he applied the description to him who stood before him. Isaiah speaks of the "Servant of God" as "bearing," not "taking away," and sin-bearing involves two elements—vital sympathy for the one who sins, and unequivocal condemnation of his sin. Hence, in bearing sin Jesus continually expressed judgment, and yet manifested divine compasssion. It is questionable whether John understood that the sufferings of Jesus were to be expiatory. Such an understanding is beyond the range of conception of any who appear in the Gospels except of Jesus himself. It is true that John was a prophet, and his word may have been a revelation; but it is well to remember, as Weiss urges, that "it is not in the nature of divine revelation to make communications which have no point of contact either in the spiritual life of the prophets or in the minds of those to whom he speaks." It is one of the notable facts of the experience of the disciples, that they were perplexed until the passion

Isaiah's description applied to Jesus

week itself, at their Master's words regarding his death. John's position was rather like that of Simeon (Luke 2:35). For these reasons the latter half of the statement appears to be an interpretation of the evangelist. This now is strengthened by the fact that on the next day the Baptist gives the simple witness, "Behold the Lamb of God!" It will, of course, be understood that this relegation of the clause to the evangelist in no way detracts from its truthfulness any more than does a like view of 17:3. All through the Gospel we shall find the evangelist adding his interpretations and comments. The brief witness, "Behold the Lamb of God," makes more intelligible the position and preaching of the Baptist. Had he held such a clear view of the expiatory, atoning death of Jesus as this whole declaration of verse 29 implies, it is difficult to understand how he could come into perplexity regarding him (Matt. 11:3).

The lamb is of Isaiah's picture

In thus answering the first question we have virtually answered the second. From the view-point of the evangelist it may be possible to think of the paschal lamb; from that of John the Baptist we must keep before us the lamb of Isaiah's likeness (Isa. 53:7).

Jesus superior to John the Baptist (30)

John well knew that this description of the Messiah was utterly different from that which filled the thoughts and hopes of his hearers, so he repeats what he had said to the deputation on the previous day: "This is he who

cometh after me, who has come to be my Master, for the very reason that from the beginning he was more exalted than I, being the very Son of God." He then explains how he came to his knowledge of Jesus as the Messiah. "I did not know him as the Messiah when first I came to bear witness of him, but I knew that I was to prepare the way for his appearance and so I began my work of baptizing with water. One day he came to be baptized, and then he was revealed to me, for, just as in prophetic vision, I saw the Spirit coming down from heaven as a dove gently descends from the upper air, and that Spirit rested upon him. In other words, I came face to face with that embodiment of meekness and holiness which gave indubitable evidence of the Spirit's presence and power. The vision was to me conclusive, since it presented to me just what he who called me to my mission told me would distinguish the one who was to make men holy by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. I have seen the very Son of God, and my witness since that day has continually been to the Messiah as such."

How John the Baptist knew Jesus (31–34)

3. *Third Testimony: To Two of His Own Disciples* (1:35–42)

The beginnings of faith (35–42)

The third day's history advances upon the other two, not in the character or fulness of the witness given, but in the fact that it sets forth the beginning of the Messianic

activity of Jesus. He is not only declared by the Baptist to be the Lamb of God, but he is received by two of John's disciples who acknowledge his claims. Faith in Jesus makes its glad beginning. It is to be noted, moreover, that this faith is not due to the witness of the Baptist, else the two who followed Jesus would not have addressed him as "Teacher." It was born in those hours when they held quiet converse with him in the abode to which he cordially invited them. So definite is the memory of that significant interview that the very time of its beginning is remembered—four o'clock in the afternoon. Andrew and John were these two disciples. With the birth of faith began the missionary spirit, and Andrew hurried to find his brother Simon, to tell him that he and John had found the Messiah. The story of the Gospel, yet to be opened before us, will show us how imperfectly they understood what they had found, but they knew enough to realize that a new force had entered into their lives. For Simon, as for John, it was a day "big with meaning." The new relationship into which he had come was to be marked by a new name. He was to be called Peter.

V

THE TESTIMONY OF PHILIP AND NATHANAEL (1:43–51)

Jesus invites Philip to go with him to Galilee (43, 44)

On the following day as Jesus decided to go forth to Galilee, with the intention probably of making a farewell visit to his home before entering upon his public ministry, as he was departing, he came upon Philip, a fellow-townsman of Andrew and Peter, from Bethsaida.[1] It was undoubtedly the same deep interest in the work of the Baptist as had brought his friends, that had drawn him to the Jordan, and Jesus, marking the earnestness of the man, invited him to accompany them on the journey northward.

Philip's testimony to Nathanael (45, 46)

They had not been long on the way when Philip meets an old friend, Nathanael,[2] on his way either to or from the Jordan, and he at once hastens to him with the glad news that he and the others of the little company had found in Jesus, the son of Joseph, of Nazareth, the very one re-

[1] Considerable uncertainty yet remains regarding the site of Bethsaida. If there were two Bethsaidas, then the most likely site for the Bethsaida of Galilee is the modern et-Tabgha, on the northwestern shore of the lake.

[2] Nathanael is generally identified with Bartholomew. There is no positive proof of this identification, but the following reasons are given for it: (1) Bartholomew is coupled with Philip in the list of the Apostles (Matt. 10: 3; Mk. 3: 18; Lk. 6: 14). (2) Bartholomew is never mentioned in John; Nathanael never by the Synoptics; Bartholomew is a patronymic (son of Tolmai), and suggests the existence of another, personal name.

garding whom Moses and the prophets had written, that is, the Messiah. Nathanael was astonished at this word, for not only was it proverbial that "out of Galilee ariseth no prophet" (7: 52), but also it was to him even more unlikely that from so obscure a town as Nazareth, whose name was not found in the Old Testament, the Messiah could come. He honestly expressed his doubt to Philip, and was earnestly invited to join them and see for himself. As Jesus saw him approaching he remarked in the hearing of those about him, "There is a man who is truly an Israelite—one who prevails with God—honest, sincere, and earnestly desirous of the truth!" Nathanael, overhearing these words, asks Jesus in surprise how he knew *him*. Through a miracle of omniscience Jesus had read the troubled but honest spirit of Nathanael, and so he tells him that while he was meditating and praying under the shade of a wayside fig-tree, before Philip had even spoken to him, his whole mind was open to him. This reply, revealing supernatural knowledge, at once dispelled all doubts, and Nathanael exclaimed, "Thou art the Son of God. Thou art the King of Israel!" His prayer under the fig-tree, that he might find him of whom the Baptist was speaking, had been answered. Jesus then said to him, "Thou believest because I said I saw thee under the fig-tree. Greater things than this miracle of knowledge shalt thou see. In me shall the dream of Jacob be fulfilled, and ye all shall see in my life and word and works those miracu-

Jesus's word to Nathanael (47, 48)

The witness of Nathanael to Jesus; the promise of Jesus to him (49–51)

lous energies and divine revelations which shall tell you of my unhindered commission with heaven and its constant presence with me."

VI

THE MIRACLE AT CANA (2:1–11)

The failure of the supply of wine at the wedding feast (1–3)

On the third day after Jesus started from the place where John was baptizing he reached Cana of Galilee, where Nathanael had his home and where Mary at the time was in attendance upon a wedding. Both Jesus and the disciples were invited to the feast, whose supply of wine, probably because of the large addition of guests, gave out.

Mary's request and its meaning

In the perplexity of the situation, Mary turned to Jesus and urged upon him the manifestation of his Messiahship. In what form she put her request we do not know, but if she asked for a miracle, she asked also for far more. She doubtless wanted the realization of the dreams which had shaped themselves from the prophecies made at his birth, from the reflections of the long years of waiting, and from the astonishing news that had just come from the Jordan. Those dreams were not, and could not be, free from the elements which tainted the hopes of even the most spiritually minded of that day—power, earthly glory, visible kingship. The time had come when Jesus must part company with even his mother in so far as she cherished such ambitions. Tenderly, earnestly he said to her, "My dear woman, your

aims and hopes are not mine. I cannot gratify you. The time has not come for the manifestation of my Messiahship. You do not understand what you are asking." Realizing her mistake, yet confident that in some way, perhaps by sending to friends or by special purchase, he would relieve the embarrassment of the festivities, she said to the servants, "Do whatever he tells you to do." Near by stood six stone jars used for customary Jewish purifications both of persons and utensils, and holding from eighteen to twenty-seven gallons. Jesus commanded the servants to fill them full of water, and, drawing thence, to carry the supply to the master of the feast. This they did. When the master of the feast tasted the wine, which had been miraculously made from the water, not knowing whence it came (only the servants who drew it from the jars knew that), he sent for the bridegroom and said to him, "Contrary to the usual custom of a feast thou hast, instead of giving poorer wine as the feast progressed, kept the good wine until now."

The reply of Jesus and Mary's confidence (4, 5)

The miracle of water made wine (6–10)

Thus in Cana of Galilee did Jesus begin to work miracles and to make evident the power with which he had been equipped at the Jordan—the power which was to be part of the revelation of his Messiahship. To the disciples alone does the miracle appear to have been a sign pointing to something beyond the display of wonderful power—hence their faith was deepened and strengthened.

The beginning of signs (11)

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF JESUS

INCIDENTS SELECTED TO ILLUSTRATE THAT SELF-REVELATION OF JESUS WHICH AWAKENED FAITH IN JUDEA, SAMARIA, AND IN GALILEE

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF JESUS

I

THE MINISTRY IN JUDEA (2:13–3:21)

1. *The Cleansing of the Temple* (2:13–22)

The time was drawing near for the feast of the Passover. Jesus went down with the family and his disciples to Capernaum to pay a visit, perhaps, to the home of Zebedee and then to join a caravan for Jerusalem. The Fourth Gospel knows nothing of any earlier visit to the capital than this, and since with the startling act of cleansing the temple the evangelist opens the public ministry of Jesus, it is well to bear in mind how completely the relation of the Master to the Holy City had been changed by all that had occurred at the Baptism. Jesus now comes to Jerusalem for the first time in the full consciousness of his Messiahship. His cleansing of the central shrine of the nation is in the eyes of the evangelist truly Messianic; it is symbolic of his whole mission. Being such, it is historically in the right place in this Gospel rather than at the last Passover where the Synoptics put it for the reason, in all probability, that they give account of but one Passover. Gradually the business of providing worshippers

Jesus goes to Capernaum (12)

He goes to Jerusalem (13)

with offerings or with money for the temple tribute had pushed itself into the Court of the Gentiles. The noise and disorder occasioned thereby, as well as the unfair advantages taken from the necessities of the purchasers, had long made this traffic a disgrace to the city. The whole of it was not only inconsistent with the purpose of the court—a place for prayer and meditation—but it was also an insult to the Gentiles. Jesus determined, irrespective of the rights of the temple police, to express his judgment upon it. As he now entered the temple, the very desecration was a call to act. Gathering up some cords lying upon the pavement, He twisted them into a small scourge, and drove the animals out of the sacred enclosure. In an indignation not to be withstood, he swept the money of the money changers onto the floor, and overturned their tables. Then turning to the dove-sellers standing in helpless anxiety beside their cages, he said, "Take these things out of the place, and do not be found again making my Father's house a house of trade." In the eyes of the people it was the act of a reformer, justified alike by the sense of guilt on the part of those who had engaged in or abetted the business, and by the sense of righteousness in those who had deplored the desecration. As the disciples beheld in wonderment the burning, consuming indignation of the Master and afterward thought upon it, the words of Psalm 69: 10 came to their minds, "Zeal for thy house shall eat me up." The Jewish authorities, however, were

He expresses his judgment of the Temple's desecration (14–17)

in a dilemma. They dared not openly condemn the act, seconded as it was by the conscience of the people, and they were unwilling to compromise themselves by recognizing its justice. They, therefore, demanded a sign or proof of his right to do such a bold deed. Jesus, avoiding a confession of Messiahship, and unwilling to make claim to the authority of a mere prophet, answered enigmatically—"Destroy this temple, as your present course of conduct surely will ultimately do, and in a short time I will build it up again." He was referring to the erection of the temple of the kingdom of heaven, which was yet to be, but they supposed that he all the while was speaking of the splendid structure which Herod began, and which at great cost through forty-six years had been rearing. Of course they derided the pretension, and thus the words were to them no sign. Long after, when the resurrection had made clear to the disciples the significance of the person and work of Jesus, this word gained a new meaning and, helped by the suggestion of the proverbial three days, they applied it to the body of the Master. This is the evangelist's view of it, and because he thus interprets it he sees in the attitude of the hierarchy the beginning of that animosity which was at last to bring its accomplishment.

The demand for a sign and the reply of Jesus (18, 19)

We have here in verse 19 a clear instance of the Johannine method of interpreting Jesus. In the record of the trial of Jesus false witnesses declared that he had

An interpretation by the evangelist (21, 22)

said that *he* would destroy the temple *made with hands* and after three days build another *not made with hands*. The falsity of this testimony lies in its italicized portions. The original form of the statement is undoubtedly that given by John, in which Jesus says nothing about his destroying the temple. At the same time the addition "made with hands" shows how clearly the Jews understood the reference of Jesus to be to the great stone structure in Jerusalem. Unless he specifically pointed by gesture to his own body, they could not well understand anything else. The phrase "made without hands" is the interpretation which they gave to the assertion of Jesus that he "would raise it in three days." John's account itself (verse 20) shows that there was no indication that Jesus pointed to his body. The whole sentence was enigmatical because referred by his hearers to the temple structure. In Samaria Jesus spoke more clearly, and we find there what he meant by "I will raise it up in three days" (4: 21, 23). He would soon erect a temple in which God would dwell in a truer sense than he ever had in the Holy of Holies. As John understood the work and word of Jesus when he wrote his Gospel, he saw that the crucifixion of Jesus and His resurrection signified in their deepest meaning historically the destruction of the temple and its ritual. He therefore reads into the words of Jesus this deeper meaning. It is, however, only in this interpretative sense that the words are

historical. Their truth is unquestionable, but they are John's interpretation.

2. *The Signs Wrought in the City* (2:23–25)

The effect of his miracles in Jerusalem

The cleansing of the Temple made Jesus the centre of interest during the days of the feast. Crowds must have attended him whithersoever he went, and we can suppose that he began immediately to preach about "the Kingdom." As a teacher he came unaccredited by school or rabbi, but power had been given him at the Jordan by which to win attention to his message. That power he now used in performing wonderful cures, and the record is that many believed on his name when they saw the miracles which he did. It must be remembered, however, that if these people looked upon him as the Messiah, it was with confused notions as to what the Messiah would be. A wonder-worker who would finally by miracle bring about the supremacy of the nation in the world they all would eagerly follow. It would be far different with many when they came to see that "the Kingdom" meant no such issue.

Jesus's distrust of a sign-begotten faith (23–25)

Jesus soon detected the mere wonder-seeking faith and was very guarded in reference to it. His long and varied experience with men had made him an expert in judging their motives. His opening work in Jerusalem had resulted in grievous disappointments as well as in cheering successes.

3. *The Conversation with Nicodemus* (3:1–15)

The purpose of the narrative; the position of Nicodemus

This scene is very closely connected with the verses immediately preceding it. A faith begotten by miracles is the faith of Nicodemus. While therefore this chapter shows how Jesus treated such a faith when it came seeking for light, the main purpose of the narrative is its record of the self-revelation of Jesus. Nicodemus, a Pharisee and a member of the Sanhedrin, is a type of the noble side of Pharisaism. His mental attitude reflects faithfully the historical situation in which he was placed. The preaching of John the Baptist allowed no exceptions to its call for repentance, and thereby gave grave offence to the religious leaders of the day. Jesus came preaching about that same Kingdom and attesting the reality and value of this message by the working of wonderful signs. Would he make the same inflexible demand alike of Pharisee or publican, of priest or social outcast? Nicodemus, deeply impressed with what he had seen, determined to seek out this new teacher and ask. Unwilling to have it known that he was cultivating intercourse with Jesus, he came by night. He came probably with a patronizing tone, and Jesus spoke to him as a representative of a class. Of all that passed between the two we have only a meagre account, but it is made up of such striking state-

ments as would fasten them upon the memory of one who listened to it.

Nicodemus's inquiries concerning the Kingdom (1–3)

"Rabbi, the miracles which we (referring to other members of the Sanhedrin) have seen you perform are to us indubitable proof that you are a teacher sent from God, for no one could do such wonderful deeds unless by God's direct assistance. In your teaching you have spoken often of the Kingdom of God. I have come in order to know more about it. Are we to see in these miracles signs of its appearing? When shall we see it? What must one do to enter into it?" "You ask me when you shall see it?" said Jesus. "I cannot tell you too emphatically that no one can see the Kingdom of God unless he has been born anew."

The reason for the surprise of Nicodemus (4)

It was not the mere wording of the demand that caused Nicodemus to hesitate, accustomed as he was to the figurative language of the Old Testament. It was the universal application of it that he could not understand. He questions further, therefore, for the purpose of drawing out an explanation. "How can a man like me, being old, be born anew? He cannot enter into his mother's womb a second time and be born, can he?"

The requirements for entering the Kingdom (5)

Jesus now advances to the interpretation of the word "anew" and says with solemn emphasis, unless one is born "of water and of the spirit" he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. Jesus sends Nicodemus, as representing

the Pharisaic party, back to the Baptist. Only by the way of John could they approach him. The terms here are generic, and mark the attitude of the soul on one side in repentance and the incoming of the divine on the other in life-giving power, without which no man can have part in the Kingdom of God. The difficulty with Nicodemus came from his education. He had been taught and had come to believe that those who sought to keep the law had thereby a claim to the Kingdom of God. "Being born again" was a requirement all well and good for those who came from without the pale of Judaism, or for those within it who had grievously sinned or in any way despised the law. Jesus surprises him by telling him that coming into the Kingdom "is conditional upon quite another and far more radical demand; upon change of heart, upon the production by the Spirit within a man of spiritual life." And that the necessity of this demand may be clear, he calls attention to the general law that no principle can produce results superior to itself, applying it here in the words, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

The necessity of the new birth (6, 7)

The child is like its parent in physical organization and in capabilities, adapted to the physical environment into which birth brings him, and yet with capacities for a higher spiritual life. That life never comes into actual being until the heart has been quickened by the Spirit. The Kingdom of God is the rule of God in the inner life.

Birth into merely national or ecclesiastical privileges does not of itself bring about the heart's acceptance of that exalted, inner Kingship. That is the outcome of the Spirit's energy. Do not, therefore, wonder that I said to you that you must be born again. The Spirit, by which one is born anew, is absolutely free and independent of all earthly conditions, especially of all Jewish conceptions as to worthiness in regard to the Kingdom of heaven.

The process of the new birth a mystery (8)

Like the wind, which blows where it will, and whose presence you can know only from its effects, not being able to tell whence it comes and whither it goes, so he who is born anew can know only from the effects in soul and life that he is born anew. The process is an utter mystery. Still Nicodemus was in perplexity. To this process of a spiritual birth he seems to have been a complete stranger. He could not, therefore, get away from the desire to have some theoretic understanding of it. Because he had no experience, he put his sad, earnest question, "How can these things be?" Jesus is justly astonished that such spiritual ignorance should be discovered in a teacher of the nation, especially as the Old Testament made it abundantly clear that he who would be obedient to the message of God should experience the Spirit's presence and blessing (Ezek. 11: 19; 18: 31; Jer. 4: 4; 31: 33). He therefore makes known to Nicodemus his real attitude of unbelief. "John the Baptist and I speak from experience; both of us bear witness to that which we have seen." You yourself came saying that no

The perplexity of Nicodemus (9, 10)

The real attitude of unbelief (11, 12)

one could do the miracles which you have seen me do unless God were with him, and yet you refuse to take the very first step toward the Kingdom of heaven; you refuse to meet the very first requirement for the Spirit's blessing. You and your colleagues will not accept one witness. How then can I make clear to you those profounder teachings regarding the Kingdom—God's purposes for the redemption and blessing of men—if you will not accept in faith such teaching as I have already given you regarding the necessity of being born anew? And yet there is no one to teach you and others about these "heavenly things" except myself, for the necessary qualification is that one should have, so to speak, gone up to heaven and dwelt there, in order to speak authoritatively of them. Only I, the Son of Man, have had such intimate and abiding communion with God (see 1 : 1) as gives one the right to say that he has "come down" from heaven and, therefore, I speak of what I know. And faith in me is not to come through that exaltation of which the nation and its leaders are dreaming—the exaltation of kingly pomp and earthly glory. Nay, rather, as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must, in God's plan and purpose, the Son of Man be lifted up. It is by a cross, by utter, loving self-sacrifice, that he is to be exalted in order that every one who accepts him by faith may have in him and through him, enduring life.

The only adequate teacher of heavenly things (13–15)

4. *Comments of the Evangelist* (3:16–21)

Interpretations of the evangelist; how they came to be and upon what they are based

The conversation with Nicodemus ends at verse 15. This fact brings us to a feature of the Gospel which merits careful attention. It is to be remembered that the evangelist wrote long after the time of the events here recorded. The author looked back upon the life and teaching of his Master from the point of view of the end of the century. Paul's splendid work had been accomplished, and his theology of the crucifixion and resurrection had been written. The whole meaning of the incarnation had been set forth. The nature, power, and reach of the Messiahship of Jesus were understood. It was possible, therefore, for the evangelist to add, where he thought it necessary, such comments upon the words of Christ as would give their full significance. In so doing he has made the words of Jesus the basis of all reflections he has written. He writes such comments not upon his own authority, but as the result of his profound insight into the character and mission of Jesus. This enlightenment of the Spirit pervades the whole Gospel and is apparent in one form or another. Weiss sees it, for example, in verses 13 and 14 of this chapter, where the definite clear outlines seem to him due to the writer's interpretation of words of Jesus which as originally spoken would not have carried us so far. Be that

as it may, we certainly have in verses 16–21 reflections of the evangelist, rather than the direct words of Jesus. Both the character of the statements and their phraseology show this. We may analyze these statements as follows:

THE MISSION OF THE SON

I. Its Source and Purpose.
  (*a*) Source: The love of God (16).
  (*b*) Purpose: To give life through faith to save the world.
II. The Consequences Attending It.
  (*a*) No judgment for him who believes (18 a).
  (*b*) Judgment upon unbelief (18 b).
    The reasons for these consequences:
      (1) The love of darkness or sin on one side, since deeds are evil.
      (2) The love of light or holiness on the other, since one does the truth.

God's purpose to save the world (16, 17)

Jesus said that God sent him "in order that everyone who believeth may have in him enduring life." The theology of Christ's day taught that the Messiah was to come to judge the Gentiles. Note that God did not send his Son to men in order to execute judgment upon them. His love was and is for the whole world, and the depth of that love can be measured only by the gift which expresses it—his only Son. God so

loved the *world* that he gave his only begotten Son in order that every one who would believe in him might have enduring life. Salvation, not judgment, was the supreme object of the Messiah's mission. At the same time judgment must attend men's attitude toward that mission. Jesus is the exponent of the spiritual. He not only shows men what a spiritual life means in its highest expression, but he also points out the way into it, and gives the power to enter. If a man, therefore, turns away from Jesus and will have nothing to do with him, he is by his very conduct under judgment. He has refused to give his life to the control of those principles and influence for which the name of the only Son of God stands. Judgment lies for him in the very nature of things. The opposite, of course, is true of him who believes, that is, who commits his life to the dominion of the spiritual.

Why judgment attends the mission of Jesus (18)

The real underlying cause of this judgment attending Christ's coming is the inward disposition of men. Those who are deliberately living sinful lives have no sympathy with goodness. They want nothing to do with that which makes the sinfulness of their sin evident to them. Any revelation of their iniquity is to be avoided. They hate the light. Naturally they would with determination keep away from him whose life and word are *the* light of the world upon all matters moral and spiritual. On the other hand, truth-loving men, wherever found, are drawn to Jesus. They welcome such light as he gives, because what they

The underlying cause of judgment (19–21)

have done has been what they have conceived to be in accord with God's will, and in the light this will only be more evident.

II

JESUS IN THE COUNTRY DISTRICTS OF JUDEA (3:22–36)

1. *The Last Witness of John the Baptist* (3:22–30)

Why Jesus goes to the country districts of Judea

After the cleansing of the temple, the various signs within the city, and the conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus left Jerusalem, and spent several months in the country districts of Judea. His presentation of himself in the metropolis had met with little response, and it had not yet been made clear by that sad indication, the imprisonment of the Baptist, that he should begin his work in Galilee. He still had his desires fixed upon the capital, and while awaiting his opportunity used the time to make preparation, much as John the Baptist himself was doing at Aenon near to Salim. Jesus was careful not to confuse his position with that of the Baptist, for he did not himself baptize with water (4:2), but his disciples in all probability preached the same message as John, and administered the same rite.

For a time the work of the two, of Jesus and of his forerunner, seemed to run parallel, and the apparent rivalry in service of the disciples of the Master caused the disciples of John anxiety and dissatisfaction. This

feeling gave the Baptist the occasion for his last recorded tribute to Jesus, to which John appends some profound reflections of his own. *It is this tribute which serves the plan of John.*

The proximity of Jesus and John the Baptist (22–24)

After the events which happened in Jerusalem, Jesus, realizing that the time had not yet come for further work in the city, withdrew with his disciples into the country districts of Judea, where he spent some time preaching about the Kingdom, while his disciples administered the rite of baptism. John the Baptist at the same time was baptizing at a place called Aenon,[1] where there was a goodly supply of water, and to which the people kept coming from all about to receive baptism. From the account in the Synoptics it would appear (Mk. 1: 14; Matt. 4: 12) that John was imprisoned immediately after the Temptation. To correct this impression, the evangelist says that John had not yet been cast into prison.

It is fair to suppose that, unhindered by the restraints of the hierarchy in the capital, large numbers came to Jesus

[1] The identification of Aenon is not yet sure. The allusion to what was done beyond the Jordan (26) shows that the place was in western Palestine. Much can be said in favor of the springs at the head of the Wady Farah. With this identification some light is thrown upon the Samaritan incident of the next chapter, for the scene of the Baptist's activity was then not far from Shechem. Weiss places its scene on the border of Galilee, along the Jordan; Furrer identifies it with the springs of Ain-Fara, about two hours distant from Jerusalem. It is to be noted that the Semitic name indicates local knowledge.

and to his disciples to be baptized. When the news of this great gathering reached the circle about John, brought perhaps by the Jew who argued with the Baptist's disciples, a discussion arose as to the respective value of the two baptisms. Indeed, it was difficult for John's disciples to understand why Jesus entered at all into competition with their master. They came to John with their perplexity. "Rabbi," they said, "he who was with you beyond the Jordan, and to whom you bore witness, has himself taken up the work of baptizing, and the people are all flocking to him. Is it fair that one whom you by your testimony introduced to public attention should set up a rival work?" John's answer, which at once and completely dismisses all thought of rivalry, is the objective point of this record.

The jealousy of the disciples of John the Baptist (25, 26)

2. *John's Last Witness to Jesus* (3:27–30)

A joyful recognition of the Master's supremacy and enlarging influence (29 e, 30).

Joyful, since (*a*) The positions of all men in honorable service are given them by God. That fact in itself carries high honor with it (27).

(*b*) He had always considered himself as the friend of the bridegroom, who can only rejoice at the bridegroom's voice.

There can be no question of rivalry when you once clearly understand that every position, every honor, every success in the service of God is the gift of heaven. Whether one shall be great or small so long as he is faithful, makes, therefore, little difference. It is an honor to be a servant in any capacity. And you yourselves will bear me witness that I distinctly have said that I am not the Messiah. I am simply the one sent to be his herald. That is the honor given me from heaven; it is sufficient.

An honor to be a servant of God in any capacity (27–29)

Or to take another figure familiar to you all (Isa. 54: 5; Hos. 2: 18), I am the bridegroom's friend, not the bridegroom. It is to the bridegroom that the bride belongs. When, therefore, I hear the bridegroom's voice and see him welcomed by an ever-increasing multitude who constitute his bride, shall I not rejoice? This success over which you are troubled is really the completion of my joy. In the very nature of things I must become less and less important, and he more and more so, as he becomes known and understood.

John the Baptist's humility (30)

3. *Reflections of the Evangelist* (3:31–36)

Again the text presents us with sufficient reasons for concluding that the evangelist is speaking, not John the Baptist. Note the use of "the Son" (35, 36), a mode of expression not likely on the lips of the Baptist; the broad, general statements in verses 32, 33, which do not well

Evidence that these words are a comment of the evangelist

comport with the situation pictured in 29; and the close connection of thought. To the thought of the superiority of Jesus to the Baptist the writer appends his reflections upon the absolute supremacy of Christ.

The section may be analyzed as follows:

THE SUPREMACY OF THE SON

I. By reason of his origin: He is from above, and so in contrast to every other teacher which is "of the earth" (31).

II. By reason of his teaching: He bears witness to what he has seen and heard (32).

The confirmation which faith gives to the supreme value of this teaching (33) and the reason (34).

III. By reason of his position: All things are given into his hand (35).

Conclusion: The consequences to men from the acceptance or rejection of one who is thus supreme (36).

The teacher "from above" (31–33)

John has emphatically declared the superiority of Jesus to himself. Let me add that not only is he thus superior, but, because of his heavenly origin, he is above all messengers and interpreters of God. They, being of earthly origin, are men like the rest of us in their whole manner of being,

feeling, and thinking. They can speak even of heavenly things only from the earthly point of view and, therefore, with the limitations of merely human conceptions. He who is of heavenly origin and, on that account, above all, bears witness to that which he has immediately seen and heard in heaven, that is, in unshadowed fellowship with God. So few of all the multitudes who have heard him or of him have received this witness that it seems as if no one had been willing to accept it. But whoever has received it has, from his own experience, been able to say "God is true," for in the words of Jesus, God's ambassador, he has heard the words of God.

God equipped Jesus and gave into his hand the destinies of men, hence the significance of faith or unbelief (34–36)

It was to this end that God gave him the Spirit without measure, namely, that he might be helped and guided in teaching men the words of the Father, whose love for the Son led him to give into the Son's hand the execution of all the divine purposes with reference to the salvation of men. Whoever, therefore, believes in the Son shall have enduring life; whoever disobeys him, refuses to commit his life to him for guidance and power, shall not see life. God's unalterable and necessary displeasure with that which is unspiritual and sinful, abides upon him.

III

THE MINISTRY IN SAMARIA (4:1–42)

1. *The Conversation with the Samaritan Woman*[1] (4:1–26)

Jesus meets a Samaritan woman at Jacob's well (1–7a)

About noon Jesus reached Jacob's well. The tradition was that on a plot of ground purchased from earlier settlers, the patriarch had dug this well, probably to avoid trouble with his neighbors, and had afterward given the possession to Joseph. It was, therefore, a spot of sacred memories both to Jew and Samaritan. Located at the foot of the northeastern slope of Mount Gerizim, it is about half a mile from the village of Askar (then called Sychar) and one mile eastward from Shechem. Here Jesus, wearied and thirsty, sat down to rest, and soon after a Samaritan woman came from the field to get a supply of water. The disciples, at least those of them who had with them the means for drawing water, had gone to the neighboring town to buy food. Jesus, therefore, asked the woman to give him a drink. In astonishment, she asked in turn how he, a Jew, could so far forget himself as to ask drink from a Samaritan, and that too, from a *woman*, for, as the evangelist explains, the Jews had little to do with the Samaritans. Through centuries, dating from the time when the Samaritans were

[1] The opening words of this chapter are considered on page 129.

refused a part in the rebuilding of the Temple after the exile, an intense feeling of bitterness had existed between them and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Forgetting his thirst, Jesus at once sought to interest the woman in himself by saying to her, "If you but knew about the free gift which God has made to the world, and who it is who is asking you for a drink, you, losing sight of all distinctions between Jew and Samaritan, would ask of him and he would give you living water." Understanding nothing of the spiritual import of these words, her mind dwells only upon physical thirst and daily needs, and so she replies, "Sir, thou hast no vessel to draw water with, and this well is deep. Where then will you get this living water of which you speak? You surely are not greater, are you, than our father Jacob, who gave us this well, and who himself, together with his children, servants and flocks, drank from it?" Keeping the figure, the Master seeks now to deepen her interest and bring her nearer to his real meaning by emphasizing the satisfying and lasting effects of this living water of which he had spoken. Every one who drinks of the water of this well becomes thirsty again. He has to come day after day for a fresh supply. On the contrary, he who drinks of the water which I shall give him shall never thirst. Indeed, the water which I shall give shall be within him a living spring bubbling up not only all through this life, but also in the endless life beyond. The contrast which Jesus all through had been drawing between the intermittent, par-

Jesus's method of approaching her (7b–10)

Her interest awakened (11–15)

tial satisfactions of a sensuous life and the deep, abiding satisfaction of fellowship with God, was unperceived. The poor woman knew nothing of soul-thirst. She had only a vague sense of such help as would save her from the necessity of coming every day to the burdensome duty of drawing water from the well, and so she asks for the water which will forever quench her physical thirst and relieve her from its wearisome demands.

Her conscience aroused (16–19)

By a sharp turn in the conversation Jesus now aims to awaken in her a sense of spiritual need. A miracle of insight had opened to him the woman's whole domestic life, and he at once framed a command which should flash upon her her guilt. "Go, call thy husband and come hither." She tried to hide her sin by an equivocal declaration, "I have no husband," but her shame became only more evident as Jesus interpreted her words. "Rightly have you said that you have no husband, for you have had five husbands—a record which means moral looseness, if not actual crime—and now you are living with a man who is not your husband. Your statement certainly is true." Awe-struck by this revelation of her history, the woman realized that she had to do with no ordinary man. "Thou art a prophet, I perceive," she said, and the acknowledgment was tantamount to a confession of her sin.

She seeks to avoid the personal directness of Jesus (20)

The conversation had become painfully personal, and by way of relief she turns to him with a question familiar to every Samaritan. Her own confession and the presence of this

Jewish prophet gave it new and momentous interest. Pointing to Mount Gerizim, upon whose summit the Samaritans had built a temple after their rejection by the Jews, and where, even though that temple had been destroyed by John Hyrcanus, in 129 B.C., the worship of her people had been continued, she said, "From the time of our ancestors this mountain has been our sacred place of worship, but you Jews declare that Jerusalem is the place where man ought to worship. Which is right?" Appealing to the faith which he had awakened Jesus replied, "The time is not far away when neither on this mountain nor on the Temple hill in Jerusalem will men worship the Father. For the present, however, Jerusalem is the right place. Your people by rejecting the messages of the prophets have missed the larger, completer revelation which God through them has given of himself, hence, relatively, though you know the God of the law, you worship in ignorance. You know nothing of those great promises which have inspired the worship of the Jews by showing them that out of their midst was to come the world's salvation. But soon even Jerusalem will have lost its distinctive honor, for the time is close at hand, yes, has already come (Jesus is referring to himself and to his few disciples) when the true worshippers of the Father will not be those who go to any specific place to worship, but those who worship him from the heart, and with a right knowledge of who and what he is. As confirming this, let me say that now and right here the Father is

Where is the right place to worship—on Gerizim or in Jerusalem? (21, 22)

True worship not a matter of place (23, 24)

God is Spirit

seeking just such worshippers. He is Spirit, as we all know. He needs no temple either here or in Jerusalem. The worship which he requires must correspond then to his nature; it must be spiritual and in accordance with truth."

The woman's hope and Jesus's declaration (25, 26)

Understanding perhaps, only that at some time, near at hand, neither Gerizim nor Jerusalem would figure in the religious life of men, but unable to comprehend the profound statements of Jesus regarding true worship, the perplexed woman anticipated the time when the great prophet —the Messiah of Samaritan expectation (Deut. 18: 18)— would come and explain to them all difficulties. "I know that he is coming," she said to Jesus in earnest confidence, "and when he comes he will make known to us all things." Without reserve, for there were no political dreams connected with the Samaritan hopes, Jesus declared to the astonished woman, "I, who am speaking to you, am the Messiah."

2. *The Return of the Disciples* (4: 27–39)

Their surprise that he converses with a woman (27)

Just at this juncture the disciples came back from Sychar. As they listened to him talking with this woman their wonderment increased, so contrary was it to all custom for a rabbi to speak with a woman. Astonishment, however, did not go so far as to lead them to ask impertinent questions, such as "What are you after?" or "Why are you talking with her?" Reverence kept them silent.

Soon after their return the woman, leaving her water-pot standing by the well, hurried away with her heart full to the town to tell of her experiences. "Come, go with me," she exclaimed in her excitement to a gathering of men whom she first met, "and see a man who has told me everything I ever did;" adding hopefully, but shyly, "You do not think he can be the Messiah, do you?" Startled by the news, they went out of the city as fast as they heard it, and all across the fields were people going toward Jesus.

The message of the woman to the town (28–30)

In the meantime the disciples urged Jesus to take some food. In the joy of the moments just gone he had forgotten weariness, thirst, and hunger. Indeed, he said virtually to the disciples, "I have had a feast of which you have no conception." Knowing little of the conversation, they did not understand him, and questioned one another as to whether any one had possibly brought him something to eat. Jesus, therefore, explains to them what he means. My food is that inner satisfaction of the heart which results from doing the will of him who sent me, and from accomplishing what he gave me to do. You recall that on our way hither as we passed through the fields of growing grain, you spoke of the promise of the harvest yet four months distant. Look there at the people hurrying toward us! How like they are, in their readiness to believe, to fields white with ripened grain ready to be garnered! So like them, indeed, that at this very hour the reaper has only to take his sickle and go to work, that both the sower and the

The higher food which Jesus had taken (31–34)

The Samaritan harvest (35)

reaper may rejoice together over the harvest home. It is but just now that I sowed the seed in the heart of the penitent woman who was here by the well. Out of this company coming to us, you, as harvesters, can have immediate reward in the ingathering of souls which shall be as eternal treasure in the garner of God. Thus can we rejoice together. This whole experience is but an ideal fulfilment of the common saying "One sows and another reaps." Moreover, what is happening to-day will be true all through your ministry. Others will have toiled and you will reap the benefit of their work and suffering.

The sower and reaper may rejoice together (36, 37)

The report of the woman had served to awaken faith in many in the city, and when they came to Jesus they invited him to stay with them, which they did for two days. It was doubtless a time full of teaching, for many more of the Samaritans believed on him because of what their own ears had heard and no longer simply because of the testimony of the woman. Just what he taught them we can only surmise, but it was full enough and explicit enough to make them confident that he was the Saviour of the world.[1]

The outcome of two days' teaching (39–42)

[1] This comprehensive description of Jesus occurs in but one other place in the New Testament (viz.: 1 John 4: 14), and it is possible that it should be here considered a Johannine conception put into the mouths of the Samaritans rather than their own confession. They acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, and this then is John's interpretation of their acknowledgment. The conception seems too large and clear for these people. On the other hand, it must be remembered that they did not have some of the prejudices to overcome which blinded the Jews; also we do not know what Jesus said and did in those two memorable days.

IV

IN GALILEE (4:43–54)

1. *The Cure of the Nobleman's Son* (4:43–54)

This last scene of the second part of the Gospel brings us again to Galilee. At the opening of the chapter a reason is given for the journey to the north, namely, the suspicious threatening attitude of the Pharisees. Verse 44 seems to give another. The two are supplementary; they give really opposite sides of the same reason. It was because of his popularity (3:26) that Jesus felt obliged to leave Judea. In Galilee he would have no apprehensions from such a source, for there in his own country he was without honor. Two considerations regarding the incident now before us must be kept in mind.

Reasons why Jesus went north to Galilee

(1) This miracle is probably not identical with the cure of the centurion's servant (Matt. 8:5; Luke 7:2). The differences between the two are too great to allow identification.[1]

This miracle probably not identical with that in Matt. 8:5

(2) This incident does not belong in the Galilean ministry, which did not begin until after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, but is an event, happening in Gali-

[1] Weiss contends for their identification; so do several recent writers upon this Gospel.

lee to be sure, but to be included in what is called the early Judean period of the Master's ministry. Note how it is referred to: "He came again to Cana." This is the second miracle which Jesus did *coming out of Judea* into Galilee. Soon after this Jesus went back to Jerusalem to the feast of Purim, and after that returned to take up his Galilean ministry.

Jesus goes to Galilee and is surprised by the reception given him (43–45)

Two days after the scene at Jacob's well Jesus departed for Galilee, for his mission was really to his own people. He had left Judea because his popularity had drawn upon him the suspicious attention of the Pharisees. Two days of happy, blessed work in Samaria had been enjoyed, and now with sad face he turned toward Galilee. No popularity there would awaken any fear about him, for the old saying that "A prophet hath no honor in his own country" was true in his experience. Imagine his surprise, therefore, when the Galileans gave him a friendly reception. The evangelist is careful to explain, however, that this reception was due to the fact that many of the Galileans had been in Jerusalem during the Passover and had been witnesses of his wonderful deeds. Their interest in him was not grounded upon a secure foundation. This is apparent in the incident which follows, which occurred in Cana, whither Jesus went either because his family had settled there, or for the reason that he was sure to find friends. The report of the miracles wrought in Jerusalem had rapidly been

spread abroad in Galilee and so came to the ears of a certain court officer in Capernaum, whose son was dangerously ill with a fever. As soon as the man knew that Jesus had returned to Galilee he determined to put the case of his boy before him. It was really the resolve of a man in desperation. He would try this wonder-worker. Accordingly, he went up from Capernaum to Cana and begged Jesus to return with him at once and heal his child. At the moment, the man's request seemed to embody the spirit of the whole people, whose one wish appeared to be to make Jesus a mere doer of wonders. They would not believe his word as a prophet. They must have from him signs in the shape of veritable marvels. This painful reflection Jesus utters in the officer's presence as if speaking directly to him, but the man's anxiety was too deep to be thus turned away, and again he begged Jesus to go with him before it was too late and his little one be dead. Jesus now puts his faith to a real test. He declines to go to Capernaum, but bids the officer return for he shall find his son living. He had now only the word of Jesus upon which to rest his faith. He had seen no miracle; he did not even have in the willingness of Jesus to go with him the promise of a miracle. He had only the declaration "Thy son liveth." This he accepted, and started homeward. The distance from Cana to Capernaum is between twenty and twenty-five miles. Somewhere on the way the servants of the officer met him and told him that his son had passed the crisis and was doing

A court officer seeks the cure of his son (46, 47)

Jesus puts the man's faith to a test and he sustains it (48–54)

well. "When did he begin to improve?" he asked. "Yesterday about one o'clock the fever left him," they replied, and then the man knew that the word of Jesus spoken at that very hour was the word of power which had saved his child. Not only he, but all his household, whose anxiety and sorrow had thus been turned into joy, believed in the divine claims of Jesus.

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF JESUS

EVENTS SELECTED TO SHOW THAT SELF-REVELATION OF THE MESSIAH WHICH WAS MADE IN THE PRESENCE OF UNBELIEF AND OPPOSITION, BOTH IN GALILEE AND JERUSALEM

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF JESUS

I

THE MIRACLE AT THE POOL OF BETHESDA (5:1–47)

1. *Introductory* (5:1)

The significance of John 5:1 in the chronology of the ministry of Jesus

In all discussions upon the chronology of the Lord's life John 5:1 occupies a very important place, and various conclusions have been reached regarding it. Nearly every feast in the Jewish calendar has been selected by different commentators as the one indicated—the Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles, or Purim. Whichever is right (and we are inclined to decide for Purim), the scenes at this feast closed the early Judean ministry, a ministry crowded full of Messianic revelations, but attended by comparatively small results. This fifth chapter is significant for John not only because of the miracles, but more especially on account of the words of Jesus. They are rich in Messianic claims. This chapter also marks the beginning of the conflict through which "unfaith" develops; the Messiahship of Jesus also stands out in teachings which are unique and exalted.

Import of this chapter as a whole

2. *Healing of the Cripple* (5:2–16)

The pool of Bethesda and its company of sick folk (2, 3)

In the course of time came a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. There was at that time in the north-eastern part of the city, not far from the Temple inclosure and near the sheep-gate or market, an intermittent thermal spring about which a pentagonal peristyle had been built and which was called in Aramaic "House of Mercy" (Bethesda). In this covered space around the pool might be seen at any time a company of poor, suffering folk—blind, lame, palsied—waiting and watching for an opportunity to get into the water while it was bubbling up from beneath, as, at that time, it was thought to have its greatest efficacy.

The especial invalid who awakened the pity of Jesus (5–7)

Among the waiting invalids was one who for thirty-eight years had been a sufferer. From talking with the man himself Jesus doubtless learned this fact, and it made a strong appeal to his compassion. In this appeal he recognized God's direction to act. "Would you like to be well?" he asked. The man could readily see that Jesus was not mocking him, and therefore the very inquiry was suggestive of hope and help. "It is not a question of desire, sir," he replied, "for I should like to be well; it is rather one of power and opportunity. I am powerless, as you see, and when the spring gushes up I have no one to plunge me into the healing waters. Another gets ahead of me, because I am so helpless and slow." Jesus then said to

him, "Get up, take your mat and walk." With the command was given the power for its execution. The man took up the piece of carpet upon which he had been lying and walked away. This all happened on the Sabbath.

His miraculous cure (8, 9)

The scene now shifts from the pool to a street in the city. As the happy man is going along carrying his mat under his arm, he is seen by some of the rabbis, who confront him with his violation of the law in carrying any burden on the Sabbath. It is to be noted that the Scribes and Pharisees were especially devoted to the discussion of two subjects: "purification" and "the Sabbath." In each case they had so amplified the law by their refinements in interpretation as to make it an almost intolerable burden; for example, they distinguished thirty kinds of work forbidden by the fourth commandment. The law indeed stands in Exodus 23: 12 and Jeremiah 17: 21, "Take heed to yourselves and bear no burden on the Sabbath day," but its intent was merciful in seeking to prevent wearying labor on the day of rest. That intent had been completely "hedged in" by the literalistic interpretations built up around it by the Scribes, so that their law read in this way: "Whosoever on the Sabbath bringeth anything in or taketh anything out from a public place to a private one, if he hath done this inadvertently he shall sacrifice for his sin; but if wilfully he shall be cut off and be stoned." Jesus in every case, as here, ignored these traditional interpretations. Naturally the "Doctors" were incensed. In response to the

The happy man confronted by the rabbis, who charge him with violating the law (10–13)

The Jewish zeal for the Sabbath

charge that he was violating the Sabbath, the man told them that the one who had made him well—certainly an adequate authority to his mind—had told him to do just what he was then doing. "Who is the fellow who commanded you to carry your mat through the city streets on this holy day?" they contemptuously asked. "I do not know," was the man's reply. It seems that Jesus, to avoid a scene, had quietly slipped out of the crowd which had gathered about the place, so the man had no further opportunity of speaking with him.

Jesus meets the healed man in the Temple (14)

Shortly after this Jesus was in the Temple, and there he found the man, engaged in all probability in offering a thanksgiving for his cure. From the word now spoken to him, "Sin no longer," we learn that his wearisome illness was due to sinful habits against which Jesus earnestly warned him, lest, indulged in again, they bring him to that spiritual death which is worse than physical disease. In this conversation the man learned Jesus's name and, as afterward he went to the authorities to justify himself for his offence against the Sabbath, he told them who had healed him. This he did from no malicious intent, but rather with the conviction that one who could do such a wonderful deed had a right to command him to violate the sacred day.

The man tells who cured him (15)

The authorities took no such view of the case, but began a determined persistent persecution of Jesus because of his disregard of their Sabbath regulations.

The defence with which he met this persecution is summed up in the words, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." Jesus agreed with the authorities in holding that the scriptural command regarding the Sabbath grounded itself upon the Sabbath rest of God (see Ex. 20:11), but he completely repudiated their conception of that rest. Rightly understood, it did not and should not exclude the preserving, protecting, healing energy of God. It was consistent with a ceaseless activity of wisdom and power, of righteousness and mercy. The cure of this helpless sufferer was but a manifestation of this mercy.

Jesus's defence of himself for his cure of the man on the Sabbath (17, 18)

"My Father worketh hitherto," and I, his Son, make his working the rule of my activity. When, as long as, and since, he works, I work. Instead of being a defence for his Sabbath conduct, these words added a new cause for hostility. In the ears of his persecutors they were pure blasphemy, since thereby he made peculiar claim to an especial relationship to God and to an equality of right of freedom in doing. A justification of this claim follows.

3. *The Teaching Following the Miracle* (5:17–47)

There are two possible views of the words given in this chapter in verses 17–47. (1) They may be considered as a single address of Jesus based upon the miracle which he had just performed. (2) They may be looked upon as the substance of several addresses upon

Two possible views of the words of verses 17–47

the Sabbath question fused together in the memory of the writer and connected with this typical instance of the cure at Bethesda. The second view, which seems preferable, is supported by the following considerations: (*a*) The statement in verse 15 "because he was doing these things on the Sabbath," that is, "because he was accustomed to do these things on the Sabbath." The address fits this broader statement. According to verse 10, it is the carrying of the pallet that stands out as unlawful. The reply of Jesus touches a much larger violation than this. He is justifying a course of conduct. (*b*) The address itself gives no hint of its historical setting. To be sure, the cure on the Sabbath is an introduction to it, but it is used simply as a typical instance, and therefore nothing is said about the effect of the discourse. It ends, as has been said of it, "in the air." Would this be the case if this were a specific address directed simply to this specific instance? (*c*) A notable intricacy of thought: verses 19, 20 are an example of this. This is a mark of Johannine form. Indeed, the whole section, if considered from the second point of view, gives opportunity for studying this very Johannine form. The question may be justly asked, How do we know that we have the substance of the words of Jesus? Two reasons may be given in reply: (1) The character of the utterances. They are not after the fashion of human imagination. (2) The support given to their genuineness by like state-

Johannine form, but truth substantially from Jesus

ments of Jesus in the Synoptics. Compare verses 17, 18 with Mark 2:27, 28; 19, 20 with Matthew 11:27 (a passage rising to the height of the Johannine Christology); 21–24 with Matthew 10:40, 11:27, 28:18; 25–29 with Matthew 25:46; 30 with Matthew 26:39; 37–40 with Luke 24:26, 27, 44–46; 41–44 with Matthew 13:15, 18:1–4; 45–47 with Luke 16:29–31. The whole section may be divided into parts, 17–30, 31–47. In order to get a comprehensive view of the thought, an analysis for each part is given. Verse 17 gives the theme which verses 19–30 sustain.

GENERAL OUTLINE OF VERSES 19–30

Theme: The Absolute and Constant Fidelity of the Son's Working to the Father's (17).

I. The Son does nothing of his own initiative (19).

II. The Son does whatever the Father does (19 b) (and this is possible) since

(*a*) The Father in his love for the Son shows to him all the things which he, the Father, does (20 a).

(*b*) The Father will include in his showing greater works than have as yet been shown (20 b) *e.g.*

Quickening (21) Spiritual Resurrection 24 a, c, 25.

(26) Bodily Resurrection 28, 29 a.

Judgment (22) Present Judgment 42 b.

(27) Final Judgment 29 b.

The purpose of (*a*) and (*b*): That all may honor the Son as they honor the Father (23).

Self is never the starting-point of the activity of Jesus (19)

I have said to you that I constantly and absolutely make my Father's activity the reason and measure of my activity. That means that I do nothing, veritably nothing, to meet my own needs or to gratify my own ambitions. Self is never the starting-point of my action. I do nothing of myself; only that which I see the Father doing. Self-originating or self-furthering action is completely shut out, for the things, whatsoever they may be (whether Sabbath violations, or not), which the Father is doing, I do likewise. My work is both coincident and coextensive with his; and it is so not simply because of a clear apprehension on my part of the spiritual meaning and purposes of my mission, but also because of the revelation of what he is doing and would have me do, which he constantly gives me through the providences in which I am placed and the appeals made to me. His constant revelation is proof of his love. You have had experience as to how I was led to perform these Sabbath cures. The time is coming when he will lead me

God reveals to him what he shall do (20a)

to the doing of greater deeds than these, that even you, who question my authority and are blind to my sonship, may marvel. These greater things are no less than "quickening" and "judgment." Are you not accustomed to pray, "Thou, O Lord, art mighty; thou quickenest the dead; thou art strong to save; thou sustainest the living by thy mercy; thou quickenest the dead by thy great compassion; thou makest good thy faithfulness to them that sleep in the dust; thou art faithful to quicken the dead. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who quickenest the dead"? Just as the Father has power to raise up the dead and quicken them, so I, his Son, under his direction can exercise this same quickening power upon whomsoever I will, whether Jew or Gentile. The one condition to my exercising it is willingness to receive it (illustrated in all these Sabbath cures). Hence the awful prerogative of judgment attends that of quickening. When the Father sent me to be the means of eternal life to whomsoever would believe, he, by that very sending, made judgment depend upon men's attitude toward me. He gave judgment as to all spiritual issues to the Son. Men decide their destinies in reference to the Son (rather than in reference to the Father). The Father judges no one except through the Son. The purpose of all this is clearly evident: it is that men should honor the Son as they honor the Father, and whoever does not honor the Son, whose work is identical with that of the Father and whose prerogatives are quickening and judging, dishonors the Father who sent him.

They shall see yet greater revelations, even quickening and judgment (20b, 21)

Judgment attends quickening (22)

All this is that men should honor the Son as they do the Father (23)

Who it is that has enduring life (24)

However incredible all this may seem to you, I cannot say to you too earnestly and emphatically that whosoever hears my word with the inner ear and believes on him who sent me, that is, accepts my message as the message of God, has enduring life and is exempt from judgment, yes, has already passed from that state of separation from God which is spiritual death into one of fellowship with him which is life. And let me solemnly assure you that the time is coming, indeed, is already here, when those who are spiritually dead shall be aroused from their indifference by the preaching of the Son of God, calling them to repent of their sins and believe on him, and those who shall have listened and responded to that preaching shall spiritually live. They shall receive life from me, the Son, to whom the Father gave it when I entered upon my mission, in order that as he himself possesses it in uninterrupted fulness, so should I, to give it to whomsoever I can. When I say "can" the implication of judgment goes with the word, for life is given only to those who will accept it and, therefore, authority has been given to me by the Father to declare judgment; judgment has been inevitably associated with my mission, because as a man I present spiritual life, the kingdom of heaven to men in a form which they can understand. It is not a theory, nor an abstraction in any form, but a life, which seeing, they must either choose or reject and thus judge themselves.

The prophecy of a spiritual resurrection (25–27)

You wonder at me for making such claims. Save your

wonderment for that hour which is on its way, when this voice which is now sounding in your ears shall call *all* the dead from their graves, and they shall come forth in a visible resurrection whose character shall be in accord with their deeds. Those who have wrought good shall enter into and realize the fulness of the heavenly life; those who have done evil shall understand the full meaning of condemnation.

Prophecy of a bodily resurrection (28, 29)

Once more let me emphasize the word with which I began. Self is never the starting-point of my action. In this solemn matter of judging I do not act "of myself." It is to gratify no personal bias, nor to express any personal feeling. It is a judgment based upon a clear perception of what essential righteousness requires. God is holy as well as loving, and his holiness is just. My judgment is made in the light of these conceptions. As I hear, I judge, and just as my action is not "of myself," because I unceasingly cooperate with the Father, so my judgment is just because I seek to do not my own will, but the holy, just will of the Father.

Neither his activity nor his judgment is "of himself" (30)

GENERAL OUTLINE OF VERSES 31–47

Theme: The Witness to the Son.

I. In itself it is complete and clear, since

(*a*) It is not a mere self-witness, but is that of another whose witness is true (31, 32).

(*b*) It is not from man (34), even though the testimony of John the Baptist was valid and the Jews welcomed him for a season (33 a, 35);

but since

(*a*) It is in the works which the Father gave for accomplishment (36);

(*b*) It is in the Scriptures (37–40).

II. To the Jews it is inadequate and futile, since

(*a*) They rejected the signs.

(*b*) They had neither ear nor eye for the personal revelations of the Father (37).

(*c*) They were guilty of a blind bibliolatry (38–40).

The causes of (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) (under II) are:

(*a*) In their lack of the love of God in their hearts (shown in the fact of verse 43).

(*b*) In their purely selfish desires (44).

The perilous issue of (*a*), (*b*), (*c*): Even Moses whom they trusted would condemn them (45); the reason for this (46).

Importance of "authority" in Jerusalem

The question of authority was always one of vital importance in Jerusalem. Involving, as it did, in this matter of cures on the Sabbath, the right to transgress Sabbath regu-

lations, it became acute. Jesus had met it by declaring that his unique relation to the Father gave him both the reason and right to do what he had done, and that that same relationship gave him authority to quicken and judge. "This is all, however," replied his opponents, "but your own affirmation; what witness have you of its truthfulness? Such testimony as this to yourself must be sustained and sanctioned." Jesus recognizing, in this instance (see 8: 14) the principle of general law that no one can hear testimony in his own cause (verse 31), proceeded to give them the required sanction. He began with the witness of God himself, saying, "There is another who beareth witness concerning me, and I know that his testimony is true." I am not referring to John the Baptist. You sent a deputation to him, and in all that he said he gave an abiding witness to the truth. But *I* look to *no* man, even though he be a prophet, for *the* witness to such a reality as my Sonship and its prerogatives. Howbeit, I call your attention to all that John said, and urge its truthfulness upon you that you may be brought into the way of salvation. He was a burning and shining lamp, and, like children, you rejoiced for a while in the brilliant light. Your pride and joy in hearing again the voice of a prophet caused you to assemble in great numbers to hear him preach; but only for a season. The call to repentance broke the spell and nothing was done to save him at last from prison and death. Earnest, faithful, true as was John's witness, I have a witness which is more conclu-

Jesus meets the demand that he be sustained by witnesses (31, 32)

Earnest, faithful, and true as was the witness of John the Baptist, he appeals to a more conclusive witness (33–36a)

sive, and it lies in all the spiritual ministries, whether natural or supernatural, which I am performing and which were given to me by the Father to accomplish. The very character of these ministries, revealing as they do love, mercy, and a spiritual purpose, is testimony to the fact that the Father has sent me. Moreover, besides the witness of these ministries is the Father's own witness in the Scripture. He has never come into your midst and by visible form or by sensible sound testified of himself, as I am now testifying. "His voice you have never heard; his form you have never seen." He has, however, through the prophets given you his word, and you have failed to get any vital, abiding hold upon it, as is evident from your unwillingness to accept him whom the Father has sent and about whom His word speaks in promise and prophecy. You search the Scriptures, counting the letters, trying to determine this or that fact about their order, place, or combination, working out curious interpretations, because you imagine that by such kind of study and diligence you shall find eternal life.[1] All through these same Scriptures is the divine message about him who shall bring life and salvation to Israel and the world—in a word, the divine message about me. No sadder evidence of your misdirected, fruitless study can be given than the fact that ye will not come to me, to whom those

Besides the witness of his spiritual ministries is the Father's witness in Scripture (36b–38)

The sad mistaken bibliolatry of the Jews (39, 40)

[1] Hillel's view of Scripture may be expressed in the saying, "He who has gotten to himself words of the law has gotten to himself the life of the world to come." (*Aboth* ii, 8).

Scriptures point, in order that ye may have life. Your bibliolatry issues in real unbelief.

Jesus does not receive honor from men (41)

Lest you may think that because of offended dignity or disappointed vanity I am condemning you, and that, after all, I am eager for your approval and praise, let me say to you that I do not receive honor from men. I have no ambition for earthly honors. Nay, the reason of my condemnation is in the fact, which I have discovered, as I have studied you and come to know you, that you have not a real love for God in your hearts. Such love would have made the Scriptures vital to you and enabled you to know God. Alas! That you possess nothing of it, is clear from your unwillingness to receive me who am come at the Father's bidding and as his representative. If another should come in his own name, seeking honor among men and making promises in terms of earthly glory, you would understand him and receive him.[1] Faith in me is simply an impossibility to those who are always solicitous about earthly preferment, substituting for the approval of the only God, the flattering judgment, the partisan homage, or the ignorant applause of their fellow-men.

Their desire for honor from men the inmost reason of their unbelief in him (42–44)

He would not accuse them; Moses himself would do that (45)

Thus I have opened to you the very inmost reason of your unbelief, but do not think that, therefore, I shall accuse you before the Father. There is no need for me to do

[1] This statement had historical verification once and again. History gives an account of sixty-four false Messiahs who all succeeded by bold assumption and large promises in winning a following among the Jews.

that. Your accuser is already before the Father—Moses, the very one in whom your hope has been placed, and whose law you have accused me of transgressing. He is there, and he will raise his voice against you. You ask me how that can be? It results from the relation of faith in Moses to faith in me. Had you intelligently, earnestly believed him, you would have believed me. Disbelief in me is disbelief in him—disbelief in the record of the promises to the patriarchs, in the types of the deliverance from Egypt, in the symbolic institutions of the law, in the promise of a prophet like to himself, for it *was of me* he wrote. If then you have missed the real meaning of what he has written, and by the Scriptures have not come to a real true faith in God and to a spiritual understanding of his promises, how can it be expected that you will believe my words?

Their whole misunderstanding of the Scriptures led to a misunderstanding of him (46, 47)

II

THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND (6:1-59)

1. *Introductory*

The critical character of this event in Galilee

The event of the feeding of the five thousand with its subsequent teaching brings us to the critical point of all that ministry of preaching and healing which is marked Galilean; to the point where half-faith is transformed into full unbelief. Again it is true that it is not so much

the miracle alone as what is said and done in consequence of the miraculous action of Jesus that interests John. The character of the true Messiah is in this chapter made to stand out not only against the disappointed misconceptions of the people, but in his vital relations to men. In the fifth chapter Jesus is presented us as in intimate union with the Father and as the source of life. Now we are to see how in vital contact with men He may be the support of life. The study of this chapter is, therefore, the study of another series of Messianic claims.

The Messiah of this chapter is shown to be the support of life

2. *The Narrative Concerning the Miracle* (6:1–21)

Afterward Jesus went away from Capernaum and its neighborhood to the other side of the Lake of Galilee (the Lake of Tiberias). The disciples had just returned from their mission, full of enthusiasm over their success, and to give them opportunity for rest Jesus had bidden them, without attracting attention, go with him to a quiet spot over on the northern shore. Curiosity and, in all likelihood, an undefined expectation were at this time widespread, for the marvellous cures which Jesus was continually performing kept a crowd always about him. Just at this time, too, the whole land was in motion, since the Passover was close at hand, making it easy to get a large multitude together. The little group, therefore, did not get away with-

Jesus takes the disciples away for rest (1)

Crowd follows them to north-eastern shore of the lake (2)

out notice and while they were crossing the crowd was hurrying around the head of the lake. Before it arrived Jesus had time to go back upon the hill-side with the disciples and talk a while. Then the people began to stream in upon them, and the sight so touched his compassionate heart, for they seemed to him like sheep without a shepherd, that he gave up his original purpose of a quiet day with his disciples, and, interpreting his compassion as the direction of the Father, taught them and healed their sick all day long. As evening drew near, the disciples, reminding him of the fact that they were in an uninhabited spot and that the people were in need of food, begged him to send the crowd away into the farms and villages to buy food.

After work of healing, Jesus determines to feed the people (3–6)

"Suppose you undertake the task of feeding them," Jesus replied, and turning to Philip, whose matter-of-fact, calculating turn of mind would at once busy itself with the question, he asked, "Where can we buy bread enough for the whole company?" It is to be noted that Jesus put this question to Philip simply to see whether it would possibly occur to the naïve disciple that there might be some other way out of the difficulty than that of calculating and buying. Jesus himself knew at the time what he intended to do. It never once entered Philip's mind that there could be any other way, so he replied after some figuring, that

But a small supply of food on hand (7–9)

thirty-five dollars' (the sum the disciples probably had on hand) worth of bread would not provide for such a crowd. "Go and see how many loaves you can find among the

people," said Jesus to the disciples. Andrew, Peter's brother, soon brought him word that there was a boy present who had five barley loaves and two small fishes to sell—a pitifully inadequate supply for so many. The time for the manifestation of divine power and help had come, and Jesus commanded the disciples to arrange the whole crowd in groups of hundreds and fifties upon the green hill-slope. Then, taking the loaves and fishes in his hands, he began, after he had given thanks to God, to break them and, by means of his disciples, to distribute them through the great company. Steadily the distribution continued until all had had plenty. Indeed, there was an abundance left and the disciples were bidden to gather this up in order that there should be no waste. The fragments amounted to twelve basketfuls.

The miracle of the loaves and fishes (10–13)

The conclusions of the crowd were quick and momentous: "This is the prophet who was to come into the world." "He has the power to lead us to victory and glory." "Let us seize him, take him to Jerusalem, and proclaim him King!" It was a critical moment for Jesus. He had to act decisively and at once, else all his work hitherto would end in ruin. He must show the people, even though in doing it he signed his own death-warrant, that he could not be the Messiah they desired. First he ordered the disciples, either because they already were joining in the enthusiasm of the crowd, or because he feared they might be caught by the infection, to go down to the boat, and, if he did not come

Effect of the miracle (14, 15)

to them by nightfall, to row over the lake in the direction of Bethsaida. Then he addressed the people, refusing to consider their wishes, and bade them go quietly away. Not desiring to go down through the moving crowd to the boat, he went further back up the hill-side and engaged in prayer.

The disciples set out for Capernaum (16–18)

It was late when the disciples went down to the shore. As it had become quite dark and Jesus had not come, they set out over the lake toward Capernaum. The water at the time was in heavy commotion, being stirred up by one of those strong wind currents common to this lake, and due in large measure to the configuration of the shores. Being driven out of their course, the disciples had rowed a long while and accomplished only about three miles when they saw Jesus walking upon the sea and getting near to the boat. In their alarm at what seemed to them a ghost they cried out, but were immediately reassured by the familiar voice of the Master, who called to them to not be afraid, since it was he. When they knew who it was they would have gladly taken him into the boat. So intent had they been upon the event of the appearance of Jesus that they did not notice the movement of the boat, which came almost immediately upon the shore for which they had set out.[1]

Jesus comes to them (19–21)

[1] It is well known that more than one commentator has concluded that, had we only John's account, there would be no good reason for supposing a miracle in connection with this scene of crossing the lake. Exegetically there is no sufficient basis for a miracle in the text since "on the sea" (19) may also mean "on the shore" (see 21:1). In that case Jesus went around by the head of the lake, and the wind driving the boat so that they were not clear as to

A large company awaits Jesus on the north-eastern shore of the lake (22, 23)

After the words of Jesus the night before, many doubtless went away home, but a large company, in ardent hope that they might yet induce him to lead them as their Messiah, had remained all night under the open sky, and with the first morning light began to look for him. The last they had seen of him had been when he went back up the hill-side. He must still be somewhere about, they thought, for there was only one boat on the beach the night before and the disciples had gone away in that without him. While they were watching and waiting some boats came across the lake toward them, and at first they supposed the disciples were returning, but the boats turned out to be from Tiberias. Concluding, at last, that he must have gone around the head of the lake, they arranged with the Tiberias boatmen to take them over to Capernaum, where they believed they would

It crosses over in boats from Tiberias and finds Jesus on plain of Gennesaret (24, 25)

their course, brought them in the very early morning near the northwestern shore where they saw Jesus. Startled at his appearance, since they did not know exactly where they were, they were quieted by his greeting, and then they wanted to take him into the boat. Hardly had they expressed their willingness when the boat's keel grated upon the shore. This natural explanation is of course impossible if Matthew's account, which includes the rescue of Peter, be accepted, but it is noteworthy that Mark, who gives the recollections of Peter, says nothing about this rescue. Why should Peter omit such a significant personal reminiscence? The omission of the event from both Mark and John arrests attention. Unless this scene is added, there seems to be no sufficient reason for the miracle, for the disciples were apparently in no great danger and Jesus did nothing for them after he came to them. Whence Matthew obtained his account cannot be known. Clearly what he gives makes the whole account miraculous, and as such it is generally received.

be most likely to find him. Jesus had apparently avoided going to this city, but he was not far away and was discovered somewhere on the plain of Gennesaret. They approached him with the question as to when he had come over to this side of the lake. At this point the teaching connected with the miracle of the feeding of the multitude begins.

3. THE TEACHING OF JESUS (6:26–59)

1. *Introductory*

Several discourses; their general character

Instead of one discourse we have here at least three, with perhaps a change of scene and of audience for each one. It is again virtually a grouping of discourses with reference to the miracle of the loaves, and these discourses are all marked by a strong Johannine impress. They show close and difficult connections; they contain fixed refrains (39, 40, 44, 54; 33, 50, 58; 35, 48, 51); they set over against the blinding literalism of the Jews the "true" spiritual interpretation. (See 28, 29; 34, 35; 52, 53). They show also views of thought which, while they may not be called Pauline, suggest Pauline influence.

2. *The First Discourse: The True Bread* (6:26–40)

I. Its Source.
   (*a*) It is given by the Father (32), through the Son (27).
   (*b*) It comes down from heaven (32, 33).

II. Its Nature,
   (*a*) It is personal and vital and spiritual (33, 35).

III. Its Power.
   (*a*) It gives life (33).
   (*b*) It satisfies hunger forever (35).

IV. Its Attainability.

It is gained not by physical exertion (27), but by spiritual work (29), which work is believing in Jesus Christ (29), or coming to him in faith. This last thought of "coming" suggests the attitude of the Jews and the truth given in 37–40 (an important parenthesis) may be analyzed as follows:

(1) The certainty of the realization of the coming in the case of those whom the Father is giving him (37 *a*). They shall reach him (the Son).

(2) The surety of the issue to those who come (37 *b*).

Reasons for (1) *and* (2):

(*a*) Jesus came to do the Father's will.

(*b*) That will includes (1) and (2):
viewed from the divine side,
viewed from the human side,
and involving

(*a*) present salvation,
(*b*) future resurrection.

Jesus lays bare the motives of the people seeking him (26)

To the question, "When and how did you come to be here?" Jesus gave the people no answer. He immediately addressed himself to the motives which were impelling people to seek him, and there was need of speaking emphatically and directly, since they had missed, or, what is practically the same thing, misinterpreted the meaning of the signs which he had hitherto given them. Only the outward or earthly side had made appeal to them. In the miracles of cure, they saw merely the healing; in that of the supply of food, only that gratification of physical need which gave seconding to their dream of that time when by the Messiah, "they should all be gathered together in the garden of Eden, and should eat and drink and satiate themselves all the days of the world." "Verily, verily," said Jesus, "you are seeking me, not because you have seen in my wonderful deeds glimpses of the spiritual revelations of the true mean-

ing of my person and work, but because you ate of the few loaves, were filled and thereby quickened in your carnal Messianic expectations. For this reason you have followed me over the wearying distance from Bethsaida Julias; for this reason you toil after me from place to place. Do not spend your energies in this way trying to get the food which perisheth—the fleeting, material satisfactions of an hour. Make it rather the object of your earnest effort to secure that food which will meet your need not only here, but all through the life beyond. You can have it as a gift from the Son of Man—one who fully understands your needs—since God, the Father, has by just such wonderful deeds as you witnessed last evening authenticated him as the one to bring to men this imperishable blessing. Fixing their thought upon the necessity of personal effort, they met his exhortation with a question reflecting the legalistic external service of God with which they were familiar. "If we are to work, what are we to do in order to satisfy God?" "You are to do this," said Jesus in reply, "commit yourself unreservedly, wholly, and forever to him whom he hath sent—to me." "That is a large demand," was their answer. What have you to show that will convince us of its legitimacy? You say that we have misunderstood the signs. If we have not seen that which we thought sufficient to lead us to hail thee as our king, what adequate sign will you offer us in order that we may believe you? The critical question really returns to *you*. "What are *you* doing to justify such

The food for which they should strive (27, 28)

What they must do (29)

The demand for a sign; something as convincing as Moses gave (30, 31)

sweeping, comprehensive requirements? Our fathers ate manna in the wilderness. Through forty years Moses gave them that wonderful bread from heaven. Do something on as grand a scale as that; show yourself greater than Moses and then it will be time to ask us to believe." To this Jesus made reply as follows: "In two essential particulars you are mistaken in your views about the manna. In the first place it was not given to your fathers by Moses, and, secondly, while it was a sort of bread from heaven, it was not really heavenly bread. My Father is giving you now that genuine bread from heaven, which Moses could not give, since the bread of God is that spiritual food which comes actually from heaven and which gives life to the world." With their thoughts intent only upon some physical interpretation of the word, they asked him to give them evermore of this kind of bread. Jesus had now brought them to the critical point of all his leading. Dropping all disguise, He said, "I am the bread of life." He who with a sense of spiritual need, born of his consciousness of sin and his own helplessness, comes to me for help and strength and hope shall in no wise be left unsatisfied—his hunger shall be surely stilled; he who in complete trust commits himself to me for spiritual power and direction in life and for salvation in death shall be as one whose thirst has been forever quenched. Alas! How different it is with you! You have seen me doing the works which the Father gave me to do; you have eaten of bread miraculously provided. Through

The true bread of heaven of far greater value than the manna (32)

"I am the bread of life" (33–35)

all these signs I have been trying to show myself to you, and yet you refuse to believe.

The sad issue of these significant days in Galilee, foreshadowing as they did his ultimate rejection by the nation, brought home to the mind of Jesus a time of earnest questioning. What is to come of my work? Is it to fail? The answer comes to him from his consciousness of his relation to the Father. It is after all *his* work and therefore cannot fail. In this way he comforts himself. That whole company which the Father, through a right conception on their part of my mission and through faith, is giving me shall reach me (find me through and in the signs), and not one who comes to me with such discerning faith, no matter who he may be, will I turn away, for the single reason that I am not come from God to exercise any preferences of my own, but solely to carry out his divine will. That will is that I shall lose not one out of all that number which he shall have given me when the end comes. Nay, rather, that I shall bring them all in the last day to a glorious resurrection. It cannot be otherwise, for it is his will, too, that every one who looks upon me as the Son and commits himself to me in trust shall have enduring life, which life in the last day shall be clothed with resurrection glory.

The source of comfort to Jesus in these dark, critical days. It is God's work (36, 37)

No one who comes to him shall be turned away; he shall bring all believers to a glorious end (38–40)

3. *The Second Discourse: Coming to (that is, believing in) the Son* (6:41–51)

I. The inner divine working necessary to it—the drawing of the Father (44), which is through "teaching" and "learning" (45) but not by direct vision of the Father; only the Son has this (46).

II. The blessing which it secures—eternal life (47), since the Son is the bread of life (48), which bread does not, as did the manna, leave men to die (49), but which, because it is the living bread from heaven (51), gives eternal life. That bread is his flesh (51).

The Jews reject his claim (41, 42)

The exalted claim of being bread from heaven was received with little favor by the Jews (the unbelieving Galileans are here so named). Indeed, as, among themselves, they compared it with what they knew about his family relations, they found in it only a blank contradiction of fact, and showed very clearly the impatience of their scepticism. "How can he, the son of Joseph, presume to say 'I am come down from heaven,' when we know both his father and his mother?"

The reply of Jesus laid bare the innermost reason of their

doubts and murmurings. The contradiction which they were emphasizing was itself the effect, not the cause, of their unbelief. "Do not find fault with me among yourselves," he said. No one can enter into close, personal, spiritual relations with me unless the Father who sent me draws him, that is, unless the Father, through experiences of mercy, through the still, small voice of conscience, through sorrow, loss, or disappointment, through his word and his messengers shall awaken him to the spiritual meaning of life and its value. God is ever trying in these ways to draw men to himself, or, what is virtually the same thing, to me; and whoever comes to me, in this sense of coming, shall have part in the resurrection of the last great day. That word from the prophets "And they shall all be taught of God," illustrates what I mean. The prophet is speaking of the condition which shall obtain in the kingdom of the Messiah. By divine teaching shall God have drawn them all to himself. It is implied, of course, that he who has heard has learned the inward meaning of the lesson taught; only he, in fact, can be said to be really taught of God. How true it is, then, that every one who heareth from the Father and spiritually understands, comes to me! In one point, however, let me guard against misunderstanding. In speaking of being taught of God it is not to be understood that this is by direct, immediate vision. No one except him whose origin is divine has had this direct, unshadowed perception of the Father.

The innermost reason of their unfaith (43, 44)

God's drawing influence upon men (45)

Only the Son has direct vision (46)

Their doubts do not change the facts regarding him and the issues for those who accept him (47–51)

It remains true, therefore, that I am come from heaven, whether you murmur or not. Hence, I say to you again in solemn assurance of the truth of what I am saying, "He who believes has enduring life." I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, yes, and they died. The manna was not spiritual food. This bread of life which I am offering is the bread which cometh down from heaven in order that any one may eat of it and may not spiritually die. It is food for the soul. It is not only the bread of life, but it is *living bread* out of heaven. If any man eat of it, he shall have within himself a spiritual supply adequate to his need on and on through the endless ages of eternity. Nay, more, this bread which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh.

4. *The Third Discourse: The Appropriation of Life* (6:52–58)

I. The means to it—eating the flesh of the Son of Man, drinking his blood (53).

II. The resulting blessings:

(*a*) Possession of enduring life (54 *a*, 57, 58).

(*b*) Abiding of the believer in the Son (56 *a*).

(*c*) Abiding of the Son in the believer (56 *b*).

(*d*) Bodily resurrection at the last day (54 *b*).

Up to this point in the discourses Jesus had identified himself with the "bread from heaven," and he has made "reaching him," "believing on him," and "eating of the bread"—varying descriptions of personal commitment to his service—the conditions of enduring life and blessedness. It had all seemed to his hearers presumptuous and enigmatical, but now he takes up a form of statement which is not only incomprehensible, but also in the highest degree offensive. He will give his flesh to eat in order that the world may live. A sharp discussion arose as to what such words could possibly mean. "How can he give us his flesh to eat?" Jesus does not explain to them the "how" of the matter, but solemnly reiterates his thought in a yet more specific form. "Verily, verily, I say to you that unless by faith you appropriate the life of the Son of Man, that is, his human life in all its spiritual significance, and by faith accept his death in its sacrificial import, you virtually have no life in yourselves." Such appropriation brings eternal life and in the last day the surety of resurrection, since 'my flesh and my blood' are the actual sustenance of man's spiritual nature. He that takes them comes into such intimate, vital relationship with me that he abides in me and I in him. Just as the living Father sent me and my whole life is in my dependence upon him and in fellowship with him, so it is in the case of one who "feeds" upon me. He shall in the same way live through and by me. This is what the bread which has come down from heaven

The world shall live by eating his flesh (52–59)

signifies. The fathers who ate the manna died; not so will the issue be to him who eats of this bread. He shall live forever."

The above words were spoken as he was teaching in the synagogue in Capernaum.

III

THE CRISIS IN GALILEE (6:60–71)

Disappointment over his spiritual claims and demands (60, 61)

These discourses in their persistent spiritualization of the Messianic ideal caused bitter disappointment. There was not a word in them suited to the carnal hopes of the hearers. Indeed, each new word made the outlook more hopeless. Jesus, perceiving how difficult his doctrine was for many who had hitherto been his disciples, tried to show them how essential to them was the spiritual in himself.

1. *The Fourth Discourse: The Essential in the Messiah is the Spiritual* (6:62–65)

I. Proofs of this:

(*a*) The (then) future fact of his ascension to heaven (62).

(*b*) The necessity of the Spirit in all communication of life (63).

II. Consequences of this:

(*a*) In the case of many it brought to light their real unbelief (64).

(*b*) It showed also the necessity of the "giving" of the Father if there was to be a true coming to the Son (65).

(*c*) It actually turned many from discipleship.

His departure some day to heaven will show how essential is the spiritual (62, 63)

You have taken offence at all that I have said which demands a spiritual apprehension and appropriation of myself. What will be your attitude if you see me give up the flesh, depart from these earthly surroundings and go back to heaven to that spiritual condition in which I once was? Will it not then be clear that the spiritual is the essential in my Messiahship? Is it not always the spirit, and the spirit alone, that is life-giving? "Flesh," without it has no abiding value; it is like manna. All the words through which I have offered myself to you are meant to be channels of the spirit and of life to you, since in believing those words you would be brought into contact with the life in me. There are, however, some of you who do not believe in this vital way. Jesus could say this, for he knew from the beginning of the discipleship of many how constantly they kept in view fleshly hopes and dreams, and from the beginning of his close association with Judas he saw that his ambitions were becoming more and more fixed

Some would not turn from carnal hopes and ambitions; why men held to these (64, 65)

in the same direction. These would ultimately drive him to betrayal. This same misdirected faith led Jesus also to the reflection that no one could come into personal spiritual relations with him unless the Father by some experience had awakened him to the spiritual meaning and value of life.

Many leave him (66)

Hereupon many of his disciples turned back and walked no longer with him.

2. *The Confession of Peter* (6:67–71)

It is possible that several weeks intervened between the discourse of Jesus recorded in 62–65 and this confession of Peter. If so, then the days were probably marked by a continual defection from the band of disciples. By Weiss and Godet this scene is identified with that given in Matthew 16: 16. It is more likely to have occurred some time before. The question of Jesus is meant to test the loyalty of the disciples in view of his refusal to satisfy the materialistic hopes of the people and their consequent repudiation of him. The significance of Peter's confession is that it is a tribute to the character of Jesus born of a maturing experience.

You will not go, too, will you, said Jesus to the twelve? Peter answering for them, said "No," and gave three rea-

sons for his answer. There is no other to whom we can go. Thou hast the words which bring enduring life to those who commit themselves to them by faith, and we in believing have come to know that thou art the one free from all sin and belonging wholly to God. Peter spoke for all, but Jesus had seen enough in these sad days to make it very evident that one of the twelve was playing a devil's part in perverting good to selfish ends. "It is true that I chose you all for myself," said Jesus, "but one of you is a devil." As the evangelist tells us, he meant Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot, for he was the one of the twelve who was, in coming days, to betray the Master.

Peter answers for the twelve that they will not leave him and tells him why (67–69)

Jesus refers to Judas (70, 71)

IV

JESUS AT THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES (7)

1. *Introductory*

Between the occurrence of the events narrated in the sixth chapter and those in the seventh intervenes a space of at least six months, for the Feast of Tabernacles was celebrated in October. Jesus had made in this intervening time journeys toward Tyre and Sidon, into the Decapolis and into northern Galilee, where the transfiguration took place. With the crisis in Galilee, however,

Six months between chapters 6 and 7

John's interest in the ministry in the northern province came to an end. The scene is immediately shifted to Jerusalem. We are introduced into the thick of conflicting estimates and again shown the Messiah in the claims which are set over against these estimates. The whole chapter is full of action. The scene is crowded with all sorts and conditions of men—"Jews," the multitude, the people of Jerusalem, the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and disciples. Here "the crisis becomes hotter; the divisions, the doubts, the hopes, the jealousies, and the casuistry of the Jews are vividly portrayed. We see the mass of the populace swaying to and fro, hardly knowing which way to turn, inclined to believe, but held back by the more sophisticated citizens of the metropolis. In the background looms the dark shadow of the hierarchy itself, intrenched behind its prejudices and refusing to hear the cause that it has already prejudged. A single timid voice is raised against this injustice, but is at once fiercely silenced." Over against all this stands the calm, serene, majestic figure of the Messiah. The chapter presents several features worthy of careful attention: (1) A fulness of detail which argues for an eye-witness. (2) Illustrations of the thematic character of John's presentation of Christ's teaching. (3) A portrayal of the nature and strength of the antagonism whose issue was Calvary.

2. *The Conversation in Galilee with His Brethren* (7:1–10)

The brothers of Jesus urge him to show himself in Jerusalem (1–5)

Afterward Jesus travelled about in Galilee, being unwilling to take up his activity in Judea, since the Jews were on the watch to kill him. The Feast of Tabernacles, however, was near at hand, and his brothers (James, Joses, Judas and Simon, Mark 6: 3) urged him to leave Galilee and go into Judea in order that his disciples from all parts of the nation, and especially those in Judea, might see his wonderful works. "You have performed them in vain here in Galilee," they said, "for the people are constantly turning away from you." Go up to the capital, where the character and worth of your deeds will be justly estimated. Abandon this equivocal position, for no man works in secret and at the same time wishes to be widely known. Since you are a worker of miracles, it is absurd to waste your time here in this distant province. Show yourself to the world as the Messiah. Let Jerusalem know who and what you are. The urgency of the brethren of Jesus came from their real perplexity about him. They had not accepted his Messiahship, and yet they were impressed by his wonderful deeds. They wished him by the way of miracles to put his claims beyond question. It was virtually the pinnacle temptation over again, and Jesus promptly replied. The seasonable moment for such public manifesta-

tion as you have in mind has not yet come. As you have only to show yourselves faithful Jews your time is always seasonable. The world is not hostile to you and cannot be, since you sympathize with its spirit and have part in its dreams and hopes. On the contrary, it has the deepest antagonism to me because I bear witness to the fact that its ways are wicked. You go up to the feast. It is not at this feast that I shall make my Messianic entry into Jerusalem. The time for that is not yet fully come.

Why Jesus refuses to comply (6–9)

After thus speaking with his brethren Jesus waited a little while in Galilee. When they were on the way to Jerusalem and the disciples with them, Jesus set out either alone or with one or two friends and reached the capital, as it were, in secret.

Jesus goes quietly to the feast (10)

3. *The Public Interest in Him* (7:11–13)

As the caravans from Galilee came in without him, the Jews kept looking for him among the crowds, asking eagerly if any one knew where he was. All the while there was a wide-spread and yet suppressed discussion going on among the people regarding him. Some were decidedly of the opinion that he was an honorable man and meant in no way to deceive; others accused him of this very aim, but all spoke guardedly on account of their fear of the Jews.

Jesus eagerly looked for and his claims discussed (11–13)

4. *The Discourse Concerning His Teaching* (7:14–24)

I. Whose it really is (16).
II. How its heavenly origin may be tested (17).
(*a*) Confirmation of the principle of verse 17 (18).
(*b*) Application of this principle or test to the Jews (19, 22–24).

Had they kept the spirit of the Mosaic law, they would not have condemned him. Their judgment, which was according to appearance, had not only led to conspicuous inconsistency, but had revealed that seeking of their own glory which made them incompetent to estimate rightly his teaching.

The Jews surprised at his knowledge of the Scriptures (14, 15)

About the time when the feast was half over (it lasted eight days) Jesus went up into the Temple and taught. Knowing that he had never studied in one of the great schools, the Jews were astonished at his knowledge of the Scriptures, and at his skill in interpreting them. Where did he acquire this power, they asked. In his answer to them Jesus said: "My teaching comes in no sense from myself. Renouncing all thoughts of my own, I seek to give only the teaching of him who hath sent me. There are two tests of this teaching which you may apply, if you will, in

The two tests of its heavenly origin (16–18)

order to prove its origin. If you are willing to do the will of God, to bring your life into harmony with his law, you will know whether my teaching is self-originated or really is from God. Again, whoever speaks his own mind, teaches his own ideas, is anxious to have personal recognition and the furtherance of his own honor, whereas he who acts rightly as the messenger of one who sends him, in no way allows personal interests to intrude into his message. His sole aim is to be truthful; there is not the slightest dishonesty in him. Try either of these tests, or both, and see whence my teaching is. Alas! Your very conduct shows how difficult it will be for you to apply such tests. You profess devotion to Moses and yet not one of you is keeping the law which he gave you in the way in which you are expecting me to keep it. With that right then do you seek to put me to death?" The crowd standing by and entirely innocent of the designs of the hierarchy, interrupted him, exclaiming, "You must be possessed. Who is seeking to put you to death?" Not noticing this interruption, Jesus continued: "You are all still scandalized at one violation of your Sabbath law which I committed here in Jerusalem. Let me call your attention to the matter of circumcision. It was just to teach you the lesson which my miracle has emphasized that Moses, who gave you the ten commandments, added thereto the older law of the Abrahamic covenant involving the strict requirement that the rite of circumcision must be administered on the eighth day, even if that were a Sabbath.

Their own conduct gave them little right to condemn him (19)

An *a fortiori* argument upholding his Sabbath cure (21–24)

If the Sabbath could give way to a mere ceremonial law in order that the command of Moses might not be disobeyed, why are you angry at me for making an entire man well on the Sabbath? Is not a work of mercy older and higher than any ritual? Let not your judgments be from mere appearance. Such judgments are bound to be superficial, and consequently unjust. In making your judgments consider the spirit, purpose and result of an act as well as its form, that your judgments may be just." [1]

[1] The apparent relation of the thought of these verses, 15–24, to that expressed in 5: 37–47 and the reference (7: 21) to the miracle recounted in the fifth chapter have led to the discussion as to whether 7: 15–24 is not a displaced section which should be put immediately after 5: 37–47. It is entirely a question of exegesis which gives the following arguments against the conclusion that the section is misplaced: (1) The question of verse 15 is not the question which should follow 5: 37–47. It fits well to verse 14. (2) The connection of verse 19 with 5: 37–47 is by no means so clear as between 19 and what immediately precedes it. Both sections refer to Moses and the unresponsive attitude of the people toward him, but in chapter 5 the reproof is concerning *faith*; in chapter 7, regarding *obedience*. (3) It must be borne in mind that the violation of the Sabbath was a "standing" and supreme cause of antagonism to Jesus. May not the question, "Why do you seek to kill me?" have called up the former experience in Jerusalem? It is expressly stated in chapter 5: 18, that on account of his Sabbath violations, of which the curing of the man with a chronic illness had been a specific and notable illustration, the Jews sought to kill him. (See Weiss on John *in loco* and Haupt in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1893.) The following order has been suggested: 6: 1–71, 5: 1–47, 7: 15–24, 1–14, 25f.

5. *The Discourse Concerning His Origin* (7:25–29)

They discuss his Messiahship from the point of view of his origin

Jesus had been speaking quite freely and boldly during the time he was in the city. Some of the inhabitants of the city who knew of the intentions of the authorities concluded from Jesus's manner of speech that there must have been some change of opinion favorable to him, and yet they were sure that he could not be the Messiah since they knew the birthplace and parents of Jesus, whereas the real Messiah, according to a current tradition, would come from no one knew where. All this finds expression in the introduction to the second brief discourse which Jesus delivered regarding his origin. The audience was probably not the same as that which heard the previous address.

THE SECOND DISCOURSE: HIS ORIGIN

I. This was known to them as far as parents, town, and province were concerned (28 *a*);

and yet

II. This was virtually unknown to them since they did not know him—the One who actually sent him (28 *b*).

(*a*) He did not come of himself.

He knew God because he came from him and was his messenger (29).

The fact that Jesus had been speaking openly and freely for some time in the city arrested the attention of some of the inhabitants, who, unlike many of the strangers from the provinces, knew what the intentions of the authorities were regarding him. They began at once to ask the reason, "It surely cannot be that the authorities have really come to know that he is the Messiah? That certainly were impossible, for we know all about the origin of this man—his home and his parents—but no one knows where the true Messiah shall come from when he comes." Such surmises and conclusions led Jesus to speak in the Temple concerning his origin. "It is true," he said, "that you know all about my birthplace, parents, and home. In so far my origin is indeed known to you, and yet this knowledge does not cover all the facts about me. There is a uniqueness about my origin which you have yet to learn. I did not set out from Nazareth on my own initiative and with the aim of gratifying a personal, self-conceived ambition. I have been *sent* to you, and that, too, by one who is the true sender, whom you do not know. The reason I know him is that I have my being from him and he has sent me.

Their discussions led Jesus to speak on the subject (25–27)

Their knowledge of his origin did not cover all the facts (28, 29)

Such claims seemed to the Jews wholly blasphemous, and as a result they sought to seize him, but circumstances held them back, when it was actually proposed to lay hands upon him. No one quite dared to make the attempt. Political considerations and lingering enthusiasms among the people were evidence that the hour for his death had not

Considerations which prevented them from laying hands upon him (30–32)

yet come. Indeed, in the crowd that day there were many who believed on him, saying to one another, "The Messiah, when he comes, will perform no more miracles than this man has already done."

6. *The Discourse Regarding His Departure* (7:30–34)

Officers sent from the Sanhedrin to arrest him

The Pharisees, who were probably always in the crowds about Jesus, watching both him and the people, listened with eager attention to the discussions that were now constantly going on, and felt warranted in taking an active official step toward his arrest. Officers were sent from the sanhedrin (here indicated by the description, the chief priests and the Pharisees) with orders to mingle in the crowds, wait for a favorable opportunity and then, having arrested him, to bring him before the court. Seeing these officers and knowing what their presence meant, Jesus delivers the third brief discourse recorded in this chapter on the subject of his departure and destination. The address may have followed the other immediately and may have been given to the same audience. It is not necessary to suppose this. The chapter seems to contain a suggestively related grouping of teachings with sufficient historical settings to account for them, rather than a narrative of the phases of one scene, and the reproduction of one discourse.

THE THIRD DISCOURSE: HIS DEPARTURE

I. The time of it—after a little while (33 *a*).
II. The terminal of it—the One who sent him (33 *b*).
III. The hopeless separation from them which it involved (34).
  (*a*) They shall seek for him and not find him (34 *a*).
  (*b*) They cannot come where he is (34 *b*).

The presence of the officers warns Jesus that his time was nearing its end (32)

As Jesus saw the officials from the sanhedrin in the company gathered about him, he was impressed anew with the foreboding that his time for action was limited, and that the opportunity for all who heard him was swiftly passing away. I shall be with you yet a little while, he said, and then I shall go to the one who sent me. You are hurrying me back to the Father from whom I brought to you a message of salvation. Later in your distress you will long to see one of the days of the Son of Man. You will recall what I have said and done, and you will "wish once again to see if it might not be that in me there were deliverance" (Wescott), but it will all be in vain. Because you will not understand me or accept the spiritual blessing which I offer you, you are simply making it impossible for yourselves to be with me where I shall be. Jesus, in saying "where I shall be," was speaking of his glorified spiritual estate in heaven. With

The Jews were deciding their own fate (33, 34)

Their blind literalism (35)

their usual blind literalness his hearers could think only of some earthly locality to which he intended to journey, and so they contemptuously questioned among themselves, Surely he does not intend, after we have rejected him, to try the rôle of the Messiah among the Jews scattered abroad in the Grecian world, and that, too, with the purpose of teaching the Greeks themselves? Such a plan would alone prove that he is no true Messiah. But even if he does mean something so absurd as this, what does his other declaration mean, "Ye shall seek me and ye shall not find me, and where I am ye cannot come?"

7. *The Discourse Regarding the True Fountain* (7:35–38)

The suggestive time when Jesus spoke about the true fountain

Again the scene changes. The last day, the eighth of the feast, had come. On this day the people left the little structures of green boughs in which they had been living in commemoration of their tent life in the wilderness, went to the Temple, and from there to their homes. The usual ceremony of the previous days of the feast, namely, the bringing of water from the pool of Siloam, was omitted on this day. Perhaps the return to their homes was symbolical of the entrance of the people into the Promised Land. In that case Jesus used the time to make more impressive the message he had to deliver. All the week the people had remembered the rock in the

wilderness out of which gushed refreshing water. On this last day they called to mind the entrance of the nation into the Promised Land, blessed with perpetual living springs. Hence, the theme of the brief address of the Master, when he stood on that last day of the feast and cried out to the assembled people.

THE FOURTH DISCOURSE: THE TRUE FOUNTAIN

I. Available for every thirsty soul (37).
II. Rendering every life partaking of it a perennial blessing (38).

On the last day of the feast, which was great because it was kept as a Sabbath, Jesus was standing where he could best command a view of the stream of people passing from the booths in which they had lived for seven days, to the Temple. The sight moved him to use the Old Testament experience which they had been joyfully commemorating, as a means of awakening attention and of offering himself to them, and so he cried out, "If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink." In me shall he find satisfaction for all spiritual need. Nay, he shall find more than that, for committal of oneself to me means not only the satisfaction of one's own soul, but also the blessing and enrichment of others. Every life in which faith abides shall be as a spring of living water sending out its life-giving stream.

Jesus the fountain satisfying spiritual need (37, 38)

8. *Comment of the Evangelist* (7:39)

The word of Jesus interpreted as referring to the Holy Spirit (39)

The word of Jesus about the believer's life being like a life-giving spring is to be understood as having its possibility in that gift of the Holy Spirit which was later to be realized by all believers. The dispensation of the Spirit had not yet begun, nor could it begin until Jesus had been fully revealed by his ascent to the Father.

9. *A General Summary of the Effect of These Addresses upon the Multitude and upon the Officials* (7:40–52)

Varying opinions regarding Jesus (40–43)

It is one of the aims of John's Gospel to show us the attitudes of men toward the Messiah. In a few words, therefore, we are given the outcome of the teaching at the Feast of Tabernacles. Some who listened concluded that Jesus was the prophet who was foretold in the Old Testament (Deut. 18:15). Others said, "He is the Messiah," to be met at once by the objection of still others, who asked if it was not simply impossible that the Messiah should come from Galilee in view of the declaration of Scripture that he should spring from the seed of David, and should come from Bethlehem, David's home. The difference of opinion led to a serious division in the crowd, and among those who repudiated his claims were some who were willing to help the officers sent by the Sanhedrin (see 32) to arrest him, but the

admiring attitude of the officers themselves, and the sympathy of many with Jesus, frustrated the purpose of his enemies. No one laid hands upon him.

The sanhedrin indignant because their officers return without Jesus (45–49)

While the crowd, in the street, was disputing the claim of Messiahship, the sanhedrin was impatiently awaiting the return of their officers. At last they came, but with no prisoner; and upon the indignant inquiry as to why they had not brought him, they had to confess that they, too, had been carried away by enthusiasm for the man. "Never has a man spoken as he did," they said. "What!" exclaimed the angered Pharisees, "have you, too, been befooled? It is incredible. There is not a single man among the rulers or Pharisees who has faith in him. It is only the accursed rabble, ignorant of the law, that listens to him. You ought to have kept your heads and arrested him."

The objection of Nicodemus and the suspicion it brought upon him (50–52)

The suggestion about the law led Nicodemus (who, although one of the Pharisees, had gone to Jesus by night) to speak. "Let me call your attention," said he, "to a principle of the law which you yourselves are ignoring, namely, its refusal to judge a man before it has heard him and known what he is doing. Does it not explicitly say: 'Thou shalt not take up a false report' (Ex. 23:1); hear the cause between your brethren and judge righteously between every man and his brother" (Deut. 1:16)? The Pharisees, however, were in no mood to consider any such righteous check upon their rash procedure. They construed the objection as a sign of personal sympathy, and contemptuously asked

Nicodemus if he, too, was a Galilean, like the rest of this man's followers. If you will examine our history you will discover that Galilee is not the true country of the prophets. That settles this case.

V

THE RUPTURE IN JERUSALEM (8:12–59)

1. *Introductory*

Time of following scenes uncertain

Omitting verses 1–11 which are considered elsewhere (see p. 361), we have in this chapter a presentation of the Messiah in scene and circumstances much like those in chapter 7. The exact time (of the scenes) cannot be stated. Jesus continued probably some time in Jerusalem after the Feast of Tabernacles was over and the events here narrated are probably selected from many that occurred in those days. So, too, the teaching is in all likelihood a condensed Johannine rendering of the words of Jesus in which we find, now an actual deliverance of the Master, now the substance of an address, now an explanation of the evangelist. The chapter bristles with opposition to the claims of Jesus and is rich in the evidence of an eye-witness of the scenes it depicts. It gives the actual rupture of Jesus with the Jews. The discourses are made up largely of reminiscences of important emphatic statements, which came in the course

Teaching probably condensed Johannine rendering

of prolonged discussions, hence the quick change of theme and the difficulty at times of getting the connection of thought. The accuracy of the reminiscences is vouched for in the results they brought about. The crisis in Jerusalem came out of the same disappointment that had caused the crisis in Galilee. The teachings in this chapter show us how Jewish pride and expectations were rebuked and how all merely Jewish claims were reckoned insufficient. The true Messiah spoke and never did it seem more ideally true than when the evangelist saw him confronting the confessedly best men of the nation with claims and conceptions which had in them no trace of earthly substance. The whole chapter may be conveniently divided into three parts: 12–20, 21–30, and 31–59.

Jewish pride rebuked; Jewish claims insufficient

2. *The First Discourse: Christ's Witness—I Am the Light of the World* (8:12–20)

I. The sufficient ground of this witness (14).
II. The legality of it (18).
III. The reason why it is not accepted (19).

This address was delivered in the treasury in the court of the women where stood the great golden candelabra. During the feast these had been lighted in commemoration of the pillar of fire which had guided Israel in the wilderness.

The place suggesting the address (20)

Jesus the light of the world (12)

The sight of them suggested the symbol which Jesus now uses, applying again the thing commemorated to himself. I am the guiding light, not of Israel simply, but of the world. He who follows me shall not walk in the darkness of sin and selfishness but shall have that perfect revelation of moral good which is life-giving.

These lofty words seemed to the Pharisees but mere self-assertion. "Thou bearest witness concerning thyself; thy witness is not true," they objected. In reply Jesus gave them the basal reason for the truthfulness of his witness.

What true witness involves (13–15)

True witness even to a single fact in the spiritual life involves a knowledge of the past and of the future. In the past lie the manifold elements out of which the present grew; in the future lies the revelation of what the present implicitly contains. He can be witness to himself who has such knowledge of his own being (Westcott). I know whence I came and whither I am going. You do not. Hence you make your judgment according to the flesh or simply from appearances and they cannot be sufficient.

Why his judgment is complete (16)

Personal censure seems to be your way of avoiding discussion, replied the Pharisees. No, said Jesus, *I* judge no man, and yet, if *I* judge, my judgment is exact and perfect, since I am not making it of myself alone, but am expressing the judgment of the Father who sent me, and whose mind I know because of my intimate spiritual fellowship with him. Also for this very reason I am satisfying the requirement of your law (Deut. 17:6; 19:15) that two witnesses shall

make valid a testimony. I am myself one of the witnesses and my Father who sent me is the other. Any deceiver could make that assumption, they derisively replied. Where is thy Father? Let him make himself heard. Alas! said Jesus, it is impossible to meet your demand, for ye know neither me nor the Father. I am come as a revelation of him to you and if you had really spiritually known me ye would have known the Father.

He satisfies the demand of their law requiring two witnesses (17–19)

It is to be noted that these words were spoken close by the treasury and also in the neighborhood of the meeting-place of the Sanhedrin, that is, close to the headquarters of his enemies, and still no one laid hands upon him, for his hour had not yet come.

3. *The Second Discourse: The Seriousness of the Difference Between the Jews and Jesus* (8:21–30)

Just when this second conversation took place cannot be definitely made out. The words of Jesus are addressed to the hostile hierarchy against whom he was being protected (20) and emphasize the sad spiritual condition of this chief tribunal of the nation. The Johannine impress may be best gathered from the comment of Sanday upon the section. "The connection appears to be confused by that reiterated self-assertion which was indeed there, but which the evangelist regards somewhat too exclusively. We can well believe

The Johannine impress upon the section

that there was more in the original of the winning pathos of the lament over Jerusalem (Luke 19:42–44), in which case we could perhaps better understand the concluding statement, 'As he spake these words, many believed on him.'" The compact character of the thought makes analysis difficult. The following outline will show the general relation of the statements made by the Master:

THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE JEWS AND HIM

I. In reference to their destiny. They cannot come to him (21); all their seeking after him shall but issue in death in the midst of their sin (21).

II. In reference to their innermost nature. They are "from beneath" while he is "from above" (23). This difference can be entirely removed by faith; unless it be so removed, death in the midst of their sin is the issue (24).

III. In reference to judgment. They are yet to be the subjects of many sentences of judgment (26).

(*a*) These judgments are part of the message of him who is true (26).

(*b*) They must therefore be spoken, painful though they may be (26).

Conclusion:

The time is coming when you shall understand this radical difference between you and me and also that my claims are true. Five distinct claims are asserted in verses 28, 29.

Because of God's protection he was again enabled to speak openly in the city, and this time he began by saying to the Jews (i. e., to his opponents): I am going away, and the time is coming when ye will seek me as a deliverer from impending national destruction, but ye shall die in your sin. Jesus was speaking really of their alienation from God and of the utter impossibility of their being where he was to be; because of this alienation heaven was closed against them. As usual they missed entirely the spiritual import of his words and they contemptuously asked if he was going to commit suicide and thus make it impossible for them to follow him, for they certainly had no desire to be found in the hell of suicides. Ignoring their ill-timed jeer, Jesus proceeded to explain why their destiny is so utterly different from his. They belong to a totally different moral order. An abyss separates life in God from life in the world of sin. By the whole measurement of this abyss are they apart. They are "from beneath," from this world; he is "from above," from God. Both terms denote in spatial relations origin and moral character, and so surely is destiny also implied that those who are "from beneath," unless by faith

The Jews misunderstand his reference to his departure (21, 22)

Why they cannot come to him (23, 24)

they commit themselves to him who is from above and who alone can save them from their sins, will and must die in their sins. In unbelieving scorn they then asked, Who art thou? Speak out plainly. His reply, in the form of a sad exclamation, was, Why do I even so much as speak with you! It seems fruitless to try and bring you by my words to a true knowledge of myself. I still have many things to say concerning you and many judgments to pronounce upon you. Indeed, as long as you continue in opposition to me my very witness to the truth must be a judgment against you. But, painful as my mission is to both you and me, I cannot decline to accomplish it. He who sent me upon it is true, and I am here to utter to the world what I have heard from him.

They ask who he is, and Jesus despairs of making them understand (25, 26)

In this conversation Jesus had not identified "him who sent me" with "the Father," and so his hearers, either because they were thinking only of an earthly deliverer or because of their persistent unwillingness to believe, failed to perceive that the whole aim of his teaching was to reveal the Father.

They utterly fail to see that he is seeking to reveal to them the Father (27)

Because of this want of perception Jesus was led to say, When you shall have lifted up the Son of Man (i. e., when by placing him upon the cross, a place shall thereby be given him on high with the Father), then certain facts will be clear to you, namely, that I am the Messiah, that not a single utterance of mine is self-originated or self-glorifying, but is wholly the expression of the Father's teaching, and

When they shall come to an understanding of him (28–30)

that he who sent me is with me; that he has not left me alone, because at every moment I do that which pleases him.

This was his answer to the rulers. It was provocative of deeper opposition on the part of many; some, however, as they listened were favorably impressed and for a time at least (see below) accepted him.

4. *The Third Discourse* (8:31–59)

The point of connection between this section and what precedes is in the statement that "many believed." Jesus now addressed himself to "the Jews who had believed," but it is altogether probable that the audience was larger than these believers. While the change from faith to intense, murderous opposition is startling, it is not incredible. The possibility of it lies in the word "Jews" which the writer is careful to use. It was to the Jews who retained their national hopes to whom Jesus was speaking. As has well been said, the state of mind here revealed is very nearly that of the Galilean crowds exhibited in chapter 6. It is because of this that Weiss finds in this section the depiction of the crisis in Jerusalem as regards the people. There is in the appeal to descend from Abraham, in the literalisms which occur in the interpretation of demonic possession and in the fierce refusal of such claims as im-

The character of the audience

Evidences of an eye-witness

ply an assumption of the divine, clear evidence of an eye-witness. On the other hand there is also evidence of compression and of fragmentariness in the account. The writer has given only the great outstanding facts of an eventful scene and, in his own way, the substance of the Lord's teaching with perhaps here and there, as in 38, 42, 44, 47, instructive elaborations of his own. There is a tone in much of it which makes us think of John, that son of thunder, who once wished to call down fire on an inhospitable Samaritan village, and who, in the first epistle bearing his name, deals in short, sharp, straight-edged descriptions of character and destiny. "Ye are of your father the devil and the lusts of your father it is your will to do." "Because I say the truth, ye believe me not." "Ye hear not because ye are not of God." "If I should say I know him not, I would be like unto you a liar." The section presents a clear picture of the inextinguishable national pride of the Jews. There are three natural subdivisions in the narrative:

Marks of Johannine impress

(1) *Encouragement and Warning to be Faithful* (8:31–36)

First subdivision (31–36): a conversation containing an encouragement and warning to those who had manifested faith in him.

THEME: ABIDING IN THE WORLD

I. Its significance—true discipleship (31).

II. Its issue:

(*a*) Knowledge of the truth (32).

(*b*) Freedom.

The objection of the Jews (33): We have always been free. The reply of Jesus (34–36):

(1) The service of sin is slavery to sin. They were in slavery.

(2) Sonship is the very opposite of slavery; only the Son can make them sons.

If the Son gave them freedom through sonship, they would be free indeed.[1]

The necessity of testing his hearers' faith (31a)

More than once Jesus was compelled to scrutinize the faith in him expressed by his hearers. Either it might have a false or insufficient basis (2: 24; 6: 15) or it might be tinctured with mistaken and misleading hopes. Only as it had some perception of his real character and looked to spiritual ideals could it be trusted to work out true and saving issues. It was necessary, therefore, to put the faith of those in Jerusalem who had confessed belief in him to the test; consequently he had said, If you abide in my word, if by continual obedience you transmute my word into life, you are truly my disciples. Two results will follow. You shall

Consequences of abiding in his word (31b, 32)

[1] The thought in 34–36 is quite elliptical; Sanday finds in this whole discussion reminiscences of Paul (Rom. 6: 16–23; Gal. 4: 30, 31; 5: 1).

have a vital understanding of those relations between God and man which constitute saving truth, and that truth thus vitally understood will set you free, on the principle that obedience to the law insures liberty. At this point the mixed nature of the faith which was being tested first appears. The hearers were not thinking of spiritual freedom.

His hearers resent the imputation of slavery (33)

They resented the implication that they were in bondage. We are the seed of Abraham and have never been in bondage to any one. The boast did not refer to their political history or status, but to their social position, for it was only rarely that a Jew was reduced to the condition of a slave. How can you say that we shall be free? The question gave Jesus his opportunity to strike out from their "faith" any element which was not purely spiritual. Let me tell you, he said in solemn earnestness (Amen, Amen), that he who commits sin, that is, lives a life of sin, is the slave of sin.

What he means by slavery (34–36)

Now a slave has no permanent footing in the house; he may be thrust out at will and sold. Only a son has an abiding relationship which makes him participator in all the father's possessions. Though claiming to be of the household of God (i. e., members of the theocracy), you are all *with respect to God* slaves, for you are all in the service of sin. Only spiritual union with God constitutes sonship. If, therefore, I, the Son in the Father's house, bring you to spiritual sonship with God (and that is my whole mission), I shall make you free, and that freedom, inasmuch as it is from sin, is freedom in very truth.

(2) *A Conversation Showing What Their Claim of Descent from Abraham Was Worth* (8 : 37–47)

THE SPIRITUAL PARENTAGE OF THE JEWS

I. It is not in Abraham. Since:
   (*a*) Their works are not such as Abraham would do, for example, their endeavor to kill him (39, 40).
   (*b*) Their works are the works of their father (41).

II. It is not in God. Since:
   (*a*) They would then love him (Jesus) for he came from God, not of his own initiative, but as sent (42).
   (*b*) They are the children of the devil (44).
   (*c*) They do not believe him who speaks the truth (45).
   (*d*) They who are children of God give ear to the words of God (47).

They have no spiritual kinship with Abraham (38)

To come back to your assertion that you are the seed of Abraham. Well do I know that you are. It is not your physical descent, however, which is for a moment in question; it is rather whether you have any spiritual kinship with him. The fact that you are seeking to kill me shows that my word has made no progress in your hearts. It has fallen

upon the stony ground of prejudice and unspiritual desire. On the principle that some adopt their fathers' thoughts you are doing what has been told you by *your* father and you are rejecting that which I tell you out of my very vision of God, my Father.

No child of Abraham would do as they were doing (39, 40)

Resenting the implication of other fatherhood, the Jews reply, Abraham is our father. If ye were the children of Abraham, responded Jesus, ye would do the works of Abraham. He was not only a man of believing obedience, but he cherished a reverential affection for those who were the messengers of divine truth. You, on the contrary, are seeking to put me to death, and the reason of your bitter hostility is that I am a man who has told you the truth which I have heard from God.

In reality you are acting from hostility to God. Abraham's conduct was the very opposite of this. Your inspiration is from quite another source; you are doing the deeds of your father.

Their claim to being children of God because children of Abraham (41)

Realizing now that Jesus was speaking of spiritual parentage they hasten to assert again the correctness of their lineage. You say that spiritually we are not the children of Abraham while you admit that literally we are. Thereby you contradict yourself. By the very fact that we are the children of Abraham we are the children of God, for Jehovah was the God of Abraham. Sonship in God is mediated by sonship in Abraham. We are the children of God's house and in the direct line of promise. Our sonship has

not been polluted by idolatry, we are not the outcome of fornication. We have our Father, even God.

The refutation of their claim (42, 43)

In refutation of all this Jesus insists upon the moral proof of such claims. If God were your Father, you would love me, for I came forth from God, from a heavenly existence with him, and through incarnation I am here. What is more, I am not come at my own suggestion nor to do my own work, but he (the God from whom I have come) sent me. Surely if you were true children of God, you would not be hostile to me. Why is it that ye cannot perceive the divine accent in all my speech? I will tell you. It is because you cannot really hear my teaching; you are spiritually deaf to my message; morally incapable of understanding it. Instead of being the spiritual children of Abraham, you have as your father the devil, whose desires you deliberately choose to accomplish. Through the whole history of man from the very beginning he has been a murderer and a hater of truth. His character is utterly truthless and so he will have nothing to do with the realm of truth. Whenever he utters what is false he speaks out of his own nature, since he is a liar and also the father of the liar. The real reason, therefore, why you do not believe me is that *I* speak the truth. Is there any one of you who from my conduct brings home to my conscience the charge of sin? If then you can find nothing in my life which in any way falsifies my teaching, why do you not believe me when I speak the truth? There is no "why" except in yourselves. It is a fact of ex-

Why they cannot really hear him (43–47)

perience that the spiritual within a man reveals the spiritual outside of him; he who is in fellowship with God as his child hears the words of God. Herein is the cause of your dulness of hearing. Ye are not the children of God.

(3) *The Preëminence of Jesus* (8:48–59)

A conversation in which Jesus meets the personal abuse of the Jews with calm, exalted assertions of his claims.

The method of men whose argument has been unanswerably met

In this subdivision we have presented to us a typical method of men whose argument has been refuted by unanswerable reasoning, the resort to personal abuse. It is the immediate precursor of violence, as it marks the rapid rise of feeling. Passion dictates when reason is humiliated. Over against the charge that he has "a devil" and that he is a blasphemous egotist, Jesus calmly states his true purpose and position. These last words bring the open rupture. In the whole conversation there is repeated evidence of "local truth and accuracy" and the stern tone that is given to all is by Sanday considered a mark of Johannine impress. "To the Apostle the darkness that hung over Jerusalem (by reason of Calvary) was never removed; even in his old age and in the peace of his Asiatic home, it still cast its shadow over his recording page." The changing themes make it impossible to gather all the teaching under a single head.

Jesus had not only denied that they were the children of God, but made them out to be children of the devil, and all because they would not listen to his truth. Such judgments could but be the outcome of an hostility which was virtually insane. We make a just estimate of you, do we not, they asked, when we say that thou art a Samaritan and demented at that? No, replied Jesus, I am not demented. It is neither hatred nor mental derangement which impels me to speak so of you and to you. All I have said springs from my desire to honor my Father—to exalt his holiness, while you for your part and on this very account load me with insults. These, however, do not really trouble me; I am not seeking my own glory. There is one who is seeking it, and in seeking it he is judging all who come into contact with me and my teaching. And that you may know the truth of this let me say to you earnestly and emphatically that if any one keeps *my* word, by obeying it he shall never see death. These last words but confirmed the Jews in their judgment regarding his sanity. "Now we know that thou art demented," they said. Abraham is dead and so are the prophets, and they kept the word of God. And yet you say that if a man shall keep your word, he shall never taste of death. Surely you are not greater than our father Abraham, who, even though he was Abraham, died—are you? Or than the prophets who are also dead? Are you equipped with a greater power against death than they? Whom do you make yourself? Taking up the last question

They charge him with insanity (48)

His motive in speaking plainly to them; God will look after his honor (49–51)

A further confirmation of his insanity (52, 53)

He makes himself nothing; God alone honors him (54, 55)

first, Jesus replied, *I* make myself nothing. If I, in obedience to my own impulse and simply for my own sake, glorify myself, my glory is nothing but vainglory. It is the Father who gives me whatever glory I have, the very one who you say is your God, and yet with all the teaching of the law and the prophets and especially of the Son, you have not through fellowship with him learned to know him. Because of my increasing fellowship with him I *do* know him. If I should say that I did not, I would be a liar, just as you are liars when you say that you do. I know him intimately and completely and I keep his word. So much in reply to your question as to whom I make myself. A word now about Abraham. You asked me if I am greater than he? Yes, for he, your father from whom you claim descent and in whom you trust, exulted in the prospect of seeing my day. Promise was made to him that in him all the families of the earth should invoke for themselves a blessing like his own. It was a Messianic promise connecting future salvation with his seed. When Isaac came to him, the son of his old age, Abraham saw such a fulfilment of the promise as to virtually open to his faith a vision of the day of the Messiah and he was glad. The Jews perceiving nothing in the expression about "seeing his day" except a literal vision of the earthly life of Jesus, exclaimed in surprise, You are not fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham? Before Abraham was born, said Jesus very solemnly to them, yes, from all eternity, is my being, my

Abraham saw his day (56)

existence. It was to the Jews virtually an assertion of equality with the great "I am" of the Old Testament Scriptures and hence unmitigated blasphemy. They picked up stones to throw at him, but Jesus slipped away unperceived out of the temple, helped, doubtless, by friends in the crowd.

Jesus asserts pre-existence (58)

VI

THE CURE OF THE MAN BORN BLIND (9:1–38)

1. *Introductory*

The opening verse of this chapter seems to connect it with what immediately precedes, in which case we should still be at Jerusalem, just after the Feast of Tabernacles. The ninth and tenth chapters are, however, closely connected, and 10:22 fixes the time as that of the Feast of Dedication, two months later. Jesus had in the meanwhile said good-by to Galilee. We do not know what brought him back to Jerusalem at this time. Already the leaders of the people had decreed (9:22) to excommunicate any followers of Jesus, hoping thus to frighten his disciples away from him. This narrative gives a typical instance of the futility of their action. There are eight signs given us in the Gospel, and this one of the cure of the man born blind is, in order, the sixth. It is the sign nature of the incident which seems to have impressed it upon the mind of the evangelist. Blind-

The time and the general circumstances

ness to the Jews, as to all men, was an especially pitiable limitation. Its darkness, helplessness, and hopelessness made it significantly symbolic.

The Messianic teaching of the chapter

The Messianic teaching of the chapter is, "I am the Light of the World,"—the means of light to blind eyes, and of spiritual light to blinded hearts. All earnest discussion on the part of the neighbors, parents, and Pharisees is in view of the miracle, and the miracle reveals him who is the light of the world. The chapter is noteworthy because of its *objective* character. It is made up almost entirely of shifting scenes, full of action, and the action is natural, vivid, and faithful both to times and circumstances. The words of another are not too strong when he says of it, "If the opponents of miracles could produce a single Jewish document in which any event known not to have happened was described with so much minuteness and verisimilitude, then it would be easier to agree with them." The chapter naturally falls into these parts: (1) The account of the miracle; (2) the succeeding discussions and investigation; (3) the spiritual outcome of the miracle.

2. *The Account of the Miracle* (9:1–7)

The question regarding the man born blind (1, 2)

As one day, two months later, in Jerusalem, Jesus was passing along he saw by the wayside a beggar who had been blind from birth. The man's pitiable condition attracted

his especial attention. To the disciples the terrible affliction was perplexing. In their view it was a punishment for sin, but, owing to the fact that the man was born blind, the question was where to lay the blame. Was the fault with his parents, or had he himself in some pre-natal condition been guilty? The latter supposition was hardly thinkable; the former was possible (Ex. 20: 5). They turned to Jesus for an answer, and the answer he gave them must have been wholly unexpected. In substance, it was this: While evil is certainly the result of sin, it is wrong to conclude that every individual case of suffering is directly connected with the sufferer's guilt, or even with that of his family. Neither this man has sinned nor have his parents, as far as his blindness is concerned. Such speculative questions are idle. Rather than asking where sin came from you ought to ask what you are to do with it. This affliction is not in order to discover the guilt of its originator, but to make manifest the works of God, who looks upon sin as a means of revealing his mercy and saving power. We, you as well as I, ought to busy ourselves with these works of him who sent me—deeds of mercy and rescue—as long as the day of life lasts. The night of death is coming when no man can work. The very fact that I am in the world makes it true that I am the light of the world. In illustration of this, he spat upon the ground, made by means of the spittle a paste of clay, and laid this upon the blind man's eyes, ordering him forthwith to go and bathe in the pool of Siloam, a pool

The answer of Jesus (3–5)

in the lower end of the Tyropæon Valley, whose name is interpreted "Sent." With his faith quickened by such material help, the man went, washed in Siloam, and went home with restored sight. The pool whose name signified "Sent" symbolized thus, in its healing function, the power of him who was sent from heaven to bring light to the world.

The cure of the blind man (6, 7)

3. *The Consequent Discussions and Investigation* (9:8–34)

The discussion about the cured man (8–10)

The appearance of the cured man at his home caused much excitement and discussion. His neighbors and those who had been familiar with the sight of him since he had been a beggar in a public place, were sure that he was the very one who was accustomed to sit in the street and beg. Some of the passers-by agreed with this; others said no, he only bears a striking resemblance to the blind man. The man himself dismissed all doubts by declaring that he was the beggar who was blind.

His testimony (11, 12)

Interest then centred in the inquiry as to how his eyes were opened. He told them his experience, as follows: "The man who is called Jesus made paste of clay, laid it upon my eyes, told me to go to Siloam and wash. This I did, and I recovered my sight." They forthwith asked, "Where is this man?" "I do not know," was the reply.

The question of the Sabbath (13–17)

In the course of the questioning and discussion, it had come to light that the cure had been wrought on the Sabbath. Whether or not the specific rabbinic direction that a paste consisting of clay and spittle should not be made on the Sabbath was in force at this time is uncertain, but it was unquestionably illegal to bring about any cure that was not necessary to save life. And yet this cure was a signal blessing. The people were uncomfortable about it; they wanted a decision from their spiritual guides, the Pharisees, and so they brought the man, who was formerly blind, to them. The Pharisees had him tell his story over, and he, shrewdly omitting some significant details, gave in substance what he had said before, namely, that Jesus had put clay upon his eyes, that he had washed, and recovered his sight. The account immediately provoked discussion. To some it appeared impossible that a man who did not observe the Sabbath could be from God. Others were equally sure that a bad man (such as some had concluded) could not do such wonderful deeds—veritable signs of God's presence—with him. The division in opinion was clear and sharp. Both sides, accordingly, made appeal to the man himself, asking him what he had to say about his benefactor on account of his opening his eyes. "He is a prophet," was the prompt reply. As the man's faith was growing clearer, so that now he saw in Jesus an accredited messenger from God, so now the unbelief of the "Jews" reveals itself more decidedly. Hitherto they had proceeded upon the assump-

tion that the miracle was a fact. Now they placed it in doubt by suspecting collusion between Jesus and the blind man. They refused to accept the latter's testimony that he had once been blind and had recovered his sight, until they had called his parents. To them they put three questions: Is this your son? Do you declare that he was born blind? How does he now see? To which they gave answer, that he was their son, and that he was born blind. The third question they prudently referred back to their son himself, declaring that they knew neither how he came to his sight nor who it was who opened his eyes. Ask him for the information, they said; he is of age and will speak for himself. The parents treated the matter in this way out of fear for the Jews, since they had already come to an agreement that if any man should confess that he (Jesus) was the Messiah that man should be put out of the synagogue. The danger of being implicated in a judgment upon the claims of Jesus led the parents, therefore, to refer all testimony about the miracle itself to their son.

The Jews seek light from the man's parents (18–23)

Failing to get much satisfaction from the parents they determined to force the man to a disavowal of the miracle by urging the test of Sabbath observance or, as another has forcefully said, "to annihilate fact by dogma." They called the cured man in again and bade him acknowledge that the whole transaction, as far as Jesus was concerned, was a deception, by giving God directly the glory. *We* know, they said, in order to overawe the poor man, on theologic

The Jews try to force a disavowal of the miracle (24, 25)

grounds, that this Jesus is a bad man. In accordance with our knowledge such a miracle is impossible, therefore there was no miracle. Their way was not so easy as they supposed. Whether the man who cured me was a bad man or not I do not know, as you say you do, but there is one thing I do know, and that is, that having been blind I now have my sight. Realizing that they had little likelihood of brow-beating him with their lofty assertions of superior knowledge, they asked him to go over again the account of his cure, hoping to involve him either in contradiction or to get some new point for attacking the miracle. This demand made the man indignant, and he turned upon them, asking them with stinging irony, why they wished to hear the story again. I have already told it to you, he said, and you paid no attention to the facts. Surely your eagerness to hear it again is not because you also wish to become his disciples? This home-thrust made them angry, and they resorted to personal abuse, making it their chief charge that *he* was a disciple of that fellow and an apostate from the law. Far from even desiring any such discipleship, we are proud to be known as the disciples of Moses. Furthermore, we know that God spoke to Moses in words that abide. He was his prophet indeed; but as for this fellow, we know nothing about who commissioned him to speak. Really, said the man, in your answer is that which is marvellous; for, on your own principles of judging a prophetic call, applied fully in the case of Moses, you should know whence a man

They ask him to recount the cure (26–29)

The cured man argues with his examiners (30–34)

is who performs a miracle, and yet you say that you do not know whence Jesus is, and he hath opened my eyes. Both you and I and all men know that God does not hear the prayers of sinful, impenitent men; especially does he not give such men miraculous approval. The conditions of acceptable prayer are that a man be a worshipper of God and intent upon doing his will. Put those conditions beside this miracle of opening my blind eyes—a miracle unique in the history of the world—and then tell me if it were possible for this man Jesus to do this, if he were not from God. Nay, if he were not sent of God he could do nothing.

The argument was to every honest Jew unanswerable. The only answer attempted in this case was abuse and persecution. Your very blindness, they said contemptuously, is proof that you came into the world with the brand of infamy upon you, and do you, a low-born, sin-smitten ignoramus, presume to teach us? They forthwith excommunicated him.

4. *The Spiritual Outcome of the Miracle* (9:35–38)

The man's response to Jesus (35–38)

Soon after, Jesus heard that they had excommunicated the man, and having found him, he said, Do you, so courageous and clear in your testimony to my being a prophet, believe in the Son of God? Do you cast yourself in complete self-commitment upon him who is the Messiah? In wondering eagerness the man asked: Who is he, that I may

thus in faith cast myself upon him? To which Jesus replied, You have both seen him with the eyes of the spirit as well as the eyes of flesh, and he who is now talking with you is the Messiah. Quickly the man exclaimed, "I believe, Lord," and he worshipped him.

VII

THE SPIRITUAL TEACHING IN CONNECTION WITH THE CURE OF THE BLIND MAN (9:39–10:42)

1. *Introductory*

It is an unfortunate division which brings a chapter heading in between 9:41 and the following thoughts. The very form of the first sentence of chapter 10, "Verily, verily," indicates that a close relationship is marked, and 10:6 seems to refer to 9:41. As far, at least, as 10:21 there is an intimate connection between this and the preceding chapter (9).

The allegory

We come now for the first time, to a peculiar form of teaching, "the allegory," which differs from the parable in that "figure and application run side by side and are interwoven with one another." We know from the Synoptics how frequently Jesus spoke in parables; does the allegory belong, then, to the "Johannine impress" upon this Gospel? In reply, two facts are noteworthy: (*a*) That there is considerable variation in the use of the

parable in the Synoptics; for example, see the rich man and Lazarus, and the Pharisee and the Publican, as compared with the Ten Virgins or the Prodigal Son; (*b*) that in the Synoptics we have repeated use of the figure of the shepherd (see Matt. 9:36 and the parable of the Lost Sheep). If, however, it be granted that the form here given is Johannine, nevertheless the substance of the teaching is undoubtedly genuine, for as Sanday remarks: "In no case does the evangelist overstep the circle of Apostolic teaching or the legitimate and necessary inference from premises that the Synoptics supply." [1]

In view of all these facts, it seems more likely that we have in form, as well as in substance, the original teaching of Jesus. Another question of interest is whether a Pauline influence is traceable in this chapter. Doctrines appear here which were certainly prominent in the Apostle's thinking. The only form in which this influence was operative may have been to quicken the mind of the evangelist to the value of certain teachings which might otherwise have been passed by. Paul's teaching in Ephesus could not surely have been ignored by John. If so, may it not have helped him to discern more clearly the meaning of the life and death of Jesus? May not this influence in part account for the very selection of events and discourses which constitute the Fourth Gospel?

Is Pauline influence seen here?

[1] See *Authorship of Fourth Gospel*, p. 170.

Jesus speaks all through this chapter with his opponents in mind. Antagonism toward him is now rapidly intensifying. A broad view of the chapter gives us a principal division at verse 22. In the verses preceding, Jesus speaks of the blessing appointed to those who follow him; in those succeeding, it is shown how increasingly he is an offence to the Jews. All through the chapter, in what may be called the objective parts of it, there are marks of an eye-witness (see verses 23, 24, 40). The two chief parts of the chapter may be subdivided: Part I: 1–6, 7–10, 11–18, 19–21; Part II: 22–33, 34–39, 40–42. As in previous chapters, we have short discourses upon different themes which are, in each case, significant as giving us views of the person and work of the Messiah. Circumstances

2. *The General Effects of the Ministry of Jesus upon the World, as Suggested by His Experiences with the Blind Man* (9:39–41)

While Jesus was speaking to the man whom he had cured the people gathered around, and with them the Pharisees. To them all Jesus said: I have come into this world of sin and strife for judgment. It is the inevitable result of my coming, and my coming, as well as the judgment attending it, was designed to bring to spiritual sight those who are in ignorance of divine truth but who still have a capacity for it; The purpose and result of the coming of Jesus (39)

likewise, to bring to total blindness those whose boasted knowledge of the law has made them incapable of receiving spiritual truth. Those of the Pharisees who were with him, probably for purposes of espionage, hearing what he had just said, exclaimed contemptuously, You do not mean to say that we, too, are blind? If you were blind, said Jesus, in the sense that you were conscious of your spiritual ignorance, and, therefore, were in earnest about seeking the light, you would not have sin, for you either would find the light, or be guiltless, if you failed. But now you keep saying that you *know* the truth, that you *have* the light. In your blind self-satisfaction you will not see the light which I bring; you refuse to believe in me and my mission, and so your sin (of unbelief) abides.

The blindness of the Pharisees (40, 41)

3. *Jesus the Shepherd* (10:1–21)

Connection of thought between chapters 9 and 10.

Just a word is needful to show the connection of thought. The contrast between the conduct of the Pharisees and Jesus in reference to the man who had received his sight suggests the allegories which follow. The "bad shepherds" are the poor "blind leaders of the blind" characterized in verses 40, 41, and all that the "good shepherd" means is beautifully depicted. The facts of chapter 9 are the basis of these extended metaphors in chapter 10. The three pictures—the Real Shepherd, the Door, and the Good Shepherd—are in

The three pictures

gradational succession. On the occasion of the violent expulsion of the man born blind, Jesus beheld with affection that true Messianic flock which was already beginning to separate itself from the ancient Israelite community. This forms the first picture. He next depicted the happy and glorious privileges which this flock, when once it was gathered around him, would enjoy, in contrast with the cruel treatment which those members of the ancient people who remained under the evil direction of their present leaders would incur. This is the second picture.

Lastly, he brought out that sentiment which was the soul of his Messianic ministry, his love for his flock; a love extending to the complete sacrifice of himself. This is the third picture. "There is nothing vague or commonplace in these delineations, which present a faithful reflection of the state of things at the time when Jesus was speaking" (Godet).

(1) THE REAL SHEPHERD (10:1–6)

I. He enters the fold by the door (2) in distinction from the one who gets in some other way (1).

II. He calls his sheep by name and leads them out (3).

III. He is followed by his sheep because they know his voice (4); a stranger they will not follow (5).

An ancient sheepfold

An ancient sheepfold was usually a walled, unroofed enclosure, into which all gained access by means of a solid door which could at night be securely fastened. Several flocks could be accommodated inside, and the sheepfold was often left in charge of an under-shepherd or porter who opened the door to the shepherds in the morning. Upon this familiar feature of the scenery of Judea Jesus based his allegory. First he seeks to give the marks of the real shepherd, as opposed to one who is not genuine; and in this contrast he has in mind on one side the Pharisees, who with no inward call or commission had assumed to be the shepherds of the fold of God, and on the other, himself, the Messiah —the real shepherd. With solemn emphasis I say to you, he began, that you can discover the real shepherd by the way he enters the fold. Because of his interest in the sheep he goes in by the door which the porter opens to him. Whereas, those whose interests are selfish, who use the flock for the furtherance of their own good, are like the thief and the robber who climb over the wall from some other direction. Witness the insistence upon their own rights on the part of the Pharisees, their imposition of their own interpretations upon the lives of the people, and their constant ambition for worldly honor. Such can never be real spiritual shepherds of God's flock. Then again, the real shepherd's voice is recognized by the flock; he calls them by name and leads them forth, and they follow him because they know his voice. Let a stranger call them and they

The marks of the real shepherd (1–6)

will run away, because he is a stranger and they do not know his voice. By all of which Jesus meant to say that there were those whose spiritual needs and perceptions enabled them to recognize his voice as the voice of one from God, to welcome his message, and to commit themselves in trust to him. These whom he—the real shepherd—knew personally and intimately, he led out from the theocracy and guided in the way of righteousness and love. No other voice could make appeal to them; it was as a stranger's voice. So the blind man had heard and followed.

To the Pharisees the allegory was an enigma. They did not understand its meaning.

(2) JESUS THE DOOR OF THE SHEEP (10:7–10)

I. All others before him making this claim are thieves and robbers (8).

II. Through him as the door, one enters into safety, liberty, and support (9).

The thief who does not recognize the door, comes to steal, kill, and destroy; I am come that they may have life, and that too in abundance[1] (10).

Jesus's purpose in this allegory

In narrating these allegories Jesus had a twofold object in view: the encouragement of the man whom he had cured, and the instruction of the Pharisees. Because these did not

[1] This verse (10) is transitional to the thought of the next allegory.

understand him he sought by a change of figure to set forth again his position as compared with theirs. In this allegory the shepherd disappears and the door of the sheepfold is made prominent. The sheepfold is now the equivalent of the Messianic salvation. Again with solemn emphasis I say to you that I am myself the means of entrance to all the spiritual blessings of God. All who before me have come making such a claim as I now make are thieves and robbers. Their pretensions to be the means by which one can get to heaven—either in the rites which they have created or in the traditions which they have made essential—are utterly false, and those who have been spiritually minded have not listened to them. I alone am the mediator of salvation. He who believes in me comes by me to that spiritual understanding of life wherein the heart has true freedom and finds spiritual sustenance. The only purpose of the "thief" to whom I have just referred is to get a grip upon the soul by his self-devised and self-flattering teachings; to pervert morally all he can thus make his own, and finally to bring them to destruction. Over against such aims stands mine, namely, to bring spiritual life to men and that, too, in abundance.

Jesus in contrast to the spiritual leaders of his time (7–10)

(3) THE GOOD SHEPHERD (10: 11–18)

Godet's words in regard to these allegories are singularly suggestive. He makes the first picture (1–6) that of the morning when the shepherd comes to take his

flock forth to the experiences of the day. "The second (7–10) depicts the life and employment of the flock in the middle of the day." The third figure (11–18) seems to bring us to the time when the shadows of evening are spreading, and the sheep which are being brought back by their shepherd to the fold, are suddenly exposed to the attacks of the wolf, who was lying in wait in their path. In this allegory the shepherd and the hireling are contrasted. The wolf is the foe.

JESUS THE GOOD SHEPHERD

I. He is willing to give his life for the sheep (11, 15). In this he is the opposite of the hireling, who flees when danger threatens the sheep (12, 13).

II. He knows his sheep and his sheep know him (14); the measure and character of this knowledge (15).

III. He will gather all his sheep into one flock. Therefore the Father loves him, since for this purpose he takes his life again after laying it down, that in the *resurrection* life he may "lead out' *all* the sheep (17).

(*a*) The acts of sacrifice and resurrection were purely spontaneous on the part of Jesus (18 *a*, *b*) yet

(*b*) They accorded with the will of the Father (18 *c*).

Contrast between good shepherd and hireling (11–13)

I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep. He who is a hireling and not a shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, when he sees the wolf coming leaves the sheep and runs away. And the wolf seizes them and scatters the flock. For the very reason that he is a hireling with no vital interest in the flock, he flies at the approach of danger. Not only am I the good shepherd in that I protect the sheep, but also I know my sheep and

How Jesus knows his followers (14, 15)

they know me. This reciprocal knowledge is based upon spiritual relationship. I know them as sympathetic with, and responsive to, spiritual truth, and they know me as the revealer of such truth, as the one whom the word of God (the Old Testament) had promised. This knowledge has both its pattern and source in the knowledge of the Father for the Son, and of the Son for the Father. It is the knowledge of intimate spiritual fellowship.

The other sheep (16)

Because I know them in this way I am laying down my life for the sheep. "Completeness of knowledge is consummated in completeness of sacrifice" (Westcott). And those for whom I am doing this are not simply the few who constitute the sheepfold of Israel. Other sheep I have which are not of this fold. They shall come from the Gentiles—from all parts of the world, from all ages and climes. I must lead them into personal relations with me; they will hear my voice, catch the divine accents in it, and they shall become one flock under one shepherd. It is because I voluntarily give up my life, that the Father loves me, and I

do not give it up in order that I may forsake it and so in death leave the sheep defenceless, but in order that I may take it again and in the resurrection life be more than ever the shepherd of the flock of God. Understand me, no one —man, evil spirit, or even God himself—takes my life from me. I am laying it down of myself, freely, spontaneously. I have the right to lay it down and the right to take it again, and yet this is in harmony with the will of God. His command does not take away the voluntariness of my action; it is framed in such a way as to leave room for it. "Thou shalt die or not die, thou shalt rise again or not rise again, according to the free prompting of thy love," is its purport.

He voluntarily gives his life (17, 18)

(4) THE RESULT OF THESE TEACHINGS (10:19–21)

As many times before (7:12, 30, 40; 9:8, 16) so now there arose again a sharp division of opinion among the Jews over what he had said. Many of them said: Why do you give him any credence whatever? He is possessed and insane. Others said: These are not the utterances of a madman, and besides, a demon surely cannot open the eyes of the blind.

The hearers discuss his words (19, 20)

4. *His Sweeping Claims* (10:22–42)

The Feast of Dedication was the annual celebration of the reconstruction of the Temple (165 B.C.) by Judas Maccabeus after its defilement by Antiochus Epiphanes.

The Feast of Dedication

It was held in December, and continued eight days. All fasting and public mourning were prohibited, for it was a time of general rejoicing and it was distinguished by the illumination of the city, the Temple, and other places throughout the land. On account of this general illumination it was called also the "Feast of Lights." Soon after the allegories regarding the shepherd Jesus delivered the addresses which here follow. The special mention of the time is probably, as Westcott says, in order to connect the subject of the Lord's teaching with the hopes associated with national deliverance.

(1) HIS WITNESS TO HIS MESSIAHSHIP (10:22–30)

I. He has given it to them more than once (25 *a*), but they will not accept it (25 *b*).

II. His works done in the name of the Father were part of it (25 *c*). They would not accept this witness (26 *a*).

Reason: They were not his sheep (26 *b*).

His Sheep (27, 28)

(*a*) hear his voice;
(*b*) are known by him;
(*c*) follow him;
(*d*) receive eternal life;
(*e*) shall never perish;
(*f*) are absolutely safe.

The next discussion which Jesus had with the Jews introduces us to the Feast of Dedication, which was in progress, when they came to him and asked how long he was going to keep them in suspense regarding himself, as to whether or not he was the Messiah. Because it was stormy weather (the feast was in December, during the rainy season), Jesus was walking under cover in the cloister on the eastern side of the temple area, that is, in Solomon's porch. Here the Jews found him, and urged him to speak openly about himself. "Drop allegories, stop speaking in figure, and tell us plainly and unequivocally if you are the Messiah!" It was the time when they were remembering the splendid work of Judas Maccabeus, and if only now they could have a Messiah who would purge the land they were ready to give him hearty support. Jesus well knew how liable to misinterpretation any direct announcement was, and so he replied, I have told you and you do not believe; and besides, the works which I am performing in my Father's name bear witness concerning me. Those show you whose representative I am, and what the nature of my mission is, but you will not accept this testimony either; and the reason is just this —that you are not of my sheep. Those who are mine recognize the divine tone of my voice—the spiritual reality in my message, and they commit themselves to me in loving obedience, following me in glad faith. So, too, I know them and to them I give life divine and enduring, in consequence of which they shall never perish, and no one shall

Jesus urged to speak openly (22–24)

He had given them evidence as to who he was (25)

Why they had not accepted it (26)

The marks of his sheep (27–30)

snatch them from my hand. Indeed, their security rests ultimately in the love and power of my Father himself, for he has given them to me, and he is greater than all. No one is able to snatch them from the Father's hand. In that blessed activity which is bringing salvation to men my Father and I are one. He works through me, and I work only through his power. My hand, in its uplifting, saving, protecting work, is his hand.

To the ears of the Jews such claims were nothing else than blasphemy, and in their indignation they again brought stones in order to stone him.

They threaten to stone him (31–33)

One moment, said Jesus, before you hurl those stones. I have shown you many noble works radiant with the Father's beneficence. For which of them, forsooth, are you now preparing to stone me? The reason of our action, the Jews replied, is not any good work which you have done, but the blasphemy of which you are guilty in that you, a man, make yourself God.

(2) THE JUSTIFICATION OF HIS CLAIM TO BE THE SON OF GOD (10:34–39)

I. From the very wording of their own law (34–36): an *a fortiori* argument.

II. From the works which he had done (37, 38).

(*a*) Had there been no works, no faith would be required.

(*b*) They are to believe the works, if not him (38 *a*); reason for this faith (38 *b*).

To the charge of blasphemy Jesus replied with an *a fortiori* argument in this way: Is it not written in your law (Ps. 82: 6) I said ye are gods? If the law (here used of the entire Old Testament) does not blaspheme in naming the judges in Israel gods, to whom the word of God came, that is, "who were thus addressed by God at their consecration to their office and *by this word* lifted up to a new dignity" (Bruce)—(and that they were so named is certain because Scripture is authoritative)—then, how can you justly say that I, whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world, am a blasphemer because I have said that I am the Son of God? Not only, from a scriptural point of view, have I uttered no blasphemy, but I have stated the truth and given you ample demonstration of it in my works. If they do not show that they are the works of God, such works as are worthy of his love and beneficence, do not believe me. If they do, then, though you do not credit my assertions on my own authority, believe these works. Let them teach you in order that you may come to know and continue to know that the Father is in me and I in the Father, that is, that God's power is expressing itself through me, and that I find all my impulses to action in him.

The argument from the word "gods" in the Old Testament (34–36)

His appeal to his works (37, 38)

While they listened to these words, his opponents had let the stones fall from their hands, but now they sought again

They threaten again; Jesus escapes (39)

to seize him; but while they were devising means to arrest him he succeeded in slipping away.

(3) THE DEPARTURE BEYOND THE JORDAN (10:40–42)

He withdraws beyond the Jordan (40–42)

Opposition made it dangerous for Jesus to remain longer in the capital, so he went away to a region where he could labor in comparative safety, and that was the territory beyond the Jordan where John the Baptist had first baptized. Here he remained about three months. Many came to him and said that, though John the Baptist himself had worked no miracle, all the things which he had said concerning him (Jesus) were true. This very correspondence between prediction and fact led to faith, and the record is that many believed on him in the Perea.

VIII

THE RAISING OF LAZARUS (11)

1. *Introductory*

The importance of this chapter

From the fifth chapter we have watched the development of the hostility of the Jews, as the deeds and words of Jesus have provoked it. In this chapter we are given the event which was the occasion of a definite settled plan to put him to death. The importance of this chapter to the Fourth Gospel is not, however, chiefly in

the critical significance of its miracle to the Jews. It is rather in its teaching. The light of the whole narrative but irradiates the declaration of Jesus, "I am the resurrection and the life." When John wrote he saw the significance of this claim as interpreted by the resurrection of Jesus himself and shall we not say too, by the theology of Paul? It is the climacteric "I am." The claim is superlatively Messianic. It contains within itself the promise that life shall not only be called out of death, but triumphantly carried through it and beyond it to a deathless blessedness. In the hour when Jesus uttered these never-to-be-forgotten words he reached the height of his Messianic declarations. Negative, as well as positive, criticism has recognized this great declaration as the theme and centre of this story. That the story itself is no ideal composition constructed to give place to this claim of Jesus is evident both in its vividness and circumstantiality. The minute touches, personal as well as geographical, the individuality in the persons brought upon the scene, and the divine-human portrait of Jesus would make the whole a literary miracle if it be not actual history. It is well to remember that the miracle itself is a sign, the seventh in the series of this Gospel (2:11; 4:54; 5:8; 6:14; 9:1; 11:44), and points beyond itself to the teaching. The emphasis in the chapter is not upon the miracle, as is always assumed in such statements as speak of it as "the climacteric miracle," and in such de-

Contains the climacteric "I am"

The story no ideal construction

mands as are unsatisfied until an adequate explanation is given for the omission of the story from the Synoptics.

Naturally the whole narrative divides itself according to its places and scenes, and of these there are three:

Scene I. In Perea.
Scene II. In Bethany.
Scene III. In Jerusalem.

2. *In Perea* (11:1–16)

Persons: Jesus, the messenger from Bethany, and the disciples.

After the Feast of Dedication Jesus went away beyond the Jordan. The bulk of the Perean ministry up to the time of the visit in Bethany is given us in Luke 11:1 to 17:10.

Lazarus at Bethany, near Jerusalem (1, 2)

While Jesus was in Perea it happened that Lazarus, of Bethany, a village about two miles from Jerusalem, was taken ill. This Bethany was distinguished from the Bethany (Jn. 1:28) where Jesus then was, also by the fact that it was the home of Mary and her sister Martha (Lk. 10:38–42),—that Mary who anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped his feet with her hair (Mk. 14:3, Jn. 12:3). Jesus was a dear friend of these sisters and it was their brother who was ill. Naturally, in their anxiety, they

sent a messenger to Jesus telling him simply the fact that his beloved friend was ill and leaving him to do what he thought best. When the word came to Jesus he said to his disciples, "This illness is not to have final issue in death. God's purpose in regard to it is not that, but rather for such manifestation of his power and love through me, his Son, as shall ultimately bring about my glorification." The love which Jesus had for Martha, her sister and Lazarus, would have impelled him to go at once upon receiving the tidings of the serious illness of Lazarus, but he could not get away under two days, doubtless owing to the presence of some work in which he was engaged. After this was completed he said to his disciples, Come, let us go again into Judea. They, however, were anxious, in view of the threatening antagonism which they had experienced in Jerusalem. It is but yesterday, they urged, that the Jews sought to stone you, and will you go again into danger? The answer of Jesus, given in the form of a parable, was suggested, perhaps, by the early dawn of the day of their departure. Just as there are twelve hours in the day in which one may walk safely, as we are now doing, without risk of stumbling, because the sunlight makes clear the way, so there is a definite time made luminous by the will of God, in which I can labor. I know that that time is not yet past, so I can go fearlessly on. The night cometh when I can no longer work: but it has not yet come. Having spoken in this way, he said to them, "Lazarus, our friend, is asleep; I am going

Martha and Mary send a messenger to Jesus (3, 4)

Jesus does not go at once; probable reason (5, 6)

The reply of Jesus to the fear of the disciples (7–13)

to awaken him." Whereupon they concluded that the crisis for Lazarus had been safely passed, for they said, "Lord, if he is asleep, he will recover." It was, therefore, necessary to tell them plainly that it was not literal sleep of which he had spoken, but of death, and so Jesus said, "Lazarus is dead. And sad as it is for those in Bethany that I could not be with them sooner, I am for your sakes glad that I was not there in that your faith will be increased and made surer. But, not to dwell upon our feelings in the matter, let us go to him." Thomas, sometimes called Didymus, who saw that Jesus was determined to go then, said to his fellow-disciples out of devotion to his Master and in the abandonment of all hope for the future, "Let us go, too, in order that we may die with him."

Jesus tells them that Lazarus is dead (14–16)

3. *In Bethany* (11:17–46)

Persons: Jesus, his friends, and the Jews. With the words, "so when Jesus came," the scene is shifted and we find ourselves upon the pleasant hill-slope near Jerusalem where Bethany stood amid olive-trees and overlooking the deep valley which descends to the Jordan plain.

Upon his arrival, Jesus learned that Lazarus had been four days in the sepulchre. According to Jewish custom burial had taken place on the day of his death, which occurred probably about the time of the messenger's arrival

Jesus finds Lazarus buried and many mourners present (17–19)

in Perea. The nearness of Bethany to Jerusalem (about two miles) enabled many from among the Jews, who were friends of the family, to visit Martha and Mary to comfort them in the loss of their brother.

Martha meets him (20–22)

As Jesus was nearing Bethany word was brought ahead of his coming, and Martha, to whom the message was delivered, hastened to meet him, leaving Mary still unacquainted with the message, sitting in the house with the friends. Martha received Jesus with the lament that had he been with them their brother would not have died. "And even now," she added, "I know that God will give you whatever you ask, even if you should ask for the life of my brother." To this Jesus made answer that her brother would rise again. The reply seemed to Martha but little more than the conventional consolation which she doubtless had received already from her Jewish friends. "Yes, I know," she said, "that he will rise in the resurrection, in that great general awakening at the last day." Just here Jesus seeks to turn Martha's thought from her brother to himself and to show her how the whole matter of resurrection is related to him. It is not, he says in substance, of the resurrection simply as a future event of which I wish you now to think, but rather of the spiritual and permanent principle of all possible resurrection, namely, the divine life which comes through me and from me to all who believe—that life, secured by committing oneself in full trust to me, is indestructible, immortal. He who carries it in his

Jesus promises her that her brother shall rise; she misunderstands (23, 24)

Jesus explains (25–27)

heart as he enters the portals of physical death shall triumph completely over death. He who in this earthly life possesses it shall never lose it. It goes on and on through the ages of eternity. It is through the life which I give to it that every human soul is victorious over death in every form. Do you believe this, Martha? Jesus asked. "Yes, Lord," was her reply. "I have come to believe that thou art the Messiah, the Son of God, who should come into the world, and in believing that, I believe every word that thou dost tell me."

Martha calls Mary (28–30)

Jesus now asked her to call her sister. With a great hope, inspired by the words just spoken to her, she went to the house and whispered to Mary that the Master was near by and had asked to see her. Mary rose quickly and went to him, to the spot outside the village where Martha had first met him and where he had stayed in order to see his friends without interruption. In Mary's case his purpose was frustrated, for the Jews who were condoling with her in the house, seeing her arise and go out quickly, followed her, thinking that in a fresh onrush of grief she was going to the sepulchre to weep and that they could give her helpful sympathy. Mary, thinking only of her great loss, as soon as she came where Jesus was and saw his face, fell at his feet, exclaiming, "If thou hadst been here, my brother would not have died." At the sight of the Jews offering their ceremonial condolences Jesus was deeply indignant. Hypocrisy always stirred him and so now it did to see these men

The Jews follow Mary out (31, 32)

Jesus indignant at sight of Jews (33, 34)

who were hostile to all that Mary and Martha held best and dearest and who also for that reason were in no true sympathy with them, mingling their hypocritical lamentations with the tears of genuine sorrow. It was, however, no time to flame out against them. By an effort which visibly agitated him, he repressed his indignation and asked where the body of Lazarus had been laid. The sisters asked him to come with them and see. On the way to the sepulchre tears, perhaps of sympathy, perhaps of joy in view of the gladness he was to bring, coursed down the Master's cheeks —seeing which the Jews commented on how he loved him. Some among them, however, could not refrain from sneeringly asking why one who asserted that he had opened the eyes of the blind had not arrived in time to prevent the death of his much-loved friend? This taunt revealing the animus of these would-be sympathizers caused indignation again to flame up in the heart of Jesus—but he had come to the sepulchre and the time for action had come. The sepulchre was a cave shut in by a stone laid against it. His first command was to take the stone away. Martha, alarmed lest her brother, disfigured by corruption, should be thus exposed to view, exclaimed, Lord, already the smell of decay must be there, for he has been four days within. Jesus meets her alarm with the reassuring question, "Did I not tell you that if you would trust me, you should see the glory of God?" Thus reminded, Martha objected no further and the stone was taken away.

Jesus weeps; some sneer at his tears (35–38)

The removal of the stone (39, 40)

Jesus prays that they may see his relation to the Father in this miracle (41, 42)

In this solemn moment of expectancy Jesus sought to impress upon all who stood around his relation to the Father in that which he was about to accomplish. This miracle was in accord with the Father's will and was to be evidence that the Father had sent him. He had prayed while in Perea that he might glorify the Father and therewith himself in this way (vs. 4) and the prayer had been answered, as, indeed, were all his prayers, so complete was his fellowship with God. And so he lifted up his eyes and said, "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. Nor is this an exceptional instance; I know that thou hearest me always, but on account of those standing around me I have given thanks to thee that they may know that thou hast sent me."

The actual miracle (43, 44)

When he had thus spoken he cried with a loud voice, "Lazarus, come forth!" Immediately he who was dead came out of the sepulchre bound hand and foot with grave-clothes; and his face was bound about with a napkin. "Take away the bandages," commanded Jesus, "and let him go away."

The result upon the bystanders (45, 46)

As the result of this wonderful deed, many of the Jews, namely, those who had come to visit Mary and had witnessed what Jesus did, believed on him. Some of them, however, with what intent does not appear, went and told the Pharisees what he had done.

4. *In Jerusalem* (11:47–53)

A faithful picture of the historical situation

Persons: The sanhedrin and Caiaphas. In this short section the historical situation in Jerusalem at that time is truly and faithfully depicted. The Pharisees were the guardians of the Messianic expectations. These expectations were largely the product of the sufferings and misfortunes of the Jews from the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. It was the duty of the sanhedrin to see to it that no false prophet misled the people. In their judgment Jesus was doing just this. If he succeeded, the sanhedrin would lose the very reason for its existence and nothing would prevent the Romans from having entire control. To men who thought thus, the conduct of Jesus, so utterly indifferent to political or national ideas, was little less than high treason. His miracle-working made him only the more dangerous. Such an act as the resurrection of Lazarus made their duty pressing. For nearly two years the Master had been watched. Reports of all his deeds and sayings had been carried to Jerusalem. The enthusiasm of the people up to the crisis in Galilee made these watch-dogs of orthodoxy hesitate about action which might be too decided. That enthusiasm had been quenched after the feeding of the five thousand, but such miracles as this would quickly cause it to burn again. "What are we doing?"

is the self-reproachful question which reflects light upon this whole situation.

The situation prompts the rulers to call a council (47, 48)

In view of the information just received the chief priests (Sadducees) and the Pharisees, usually religious opponents, united in calling a council. "Why are we not doing something?" they asked. Why are we dallying when this fellow is working miracle after miracle? If we let him go on in this way he will at last have the whole nation on his side and then, in the attempt to make him the Messiah, an insurrection will surely ensue. Such an issue means that the Romans will interfere and take from us both our capital and our nation.

The speech of Caiaphas (49, 50)

After considerable discussion, a certain one of their number, Caiaphas by name, the high-priest of that fatal year of the Lord's death, stood up and said: "When it comes to questions of policy you seem to be helplessly ignorant. It never seems to occur to you that it would be better to put this one dangerous man out of the way for the good of the people rather than let matters through him come to such a pass that the whole nation will be destroyed. That means, of course, our destruction as well." The council voted to adopt this policy of Caiaphas and from that time on the question was simply "when they should put him to death."

The unconscious prophecy of Caiaphas (51–53)

In this recommendation of an unscrupulous diplomatist the evangelist saw an unconscious prophecy. The high-priest, supposing he was astutely managing affairs so as to

safeguard the power of himself and his associates, was really forwarding the plan of God, which was, through the sacrifice of one, to make all priesthood superfluous. Thus is the wrath of man made to praise him. Jesus was to die not only for the nation, but also that he might gather the children of God, who were scattered in various places, into one people where distinction of race, color, and clime would be lost in the brotherhood of his disciples.

5. *Jesus Goes to Ephraim* (11:54)

Because of this decision of the council Jesus, fully conscious of his dangerous position, stopped his free, open intercourse with Jews, left Jerusalem, and sought refuge in a town called Ephraim, situated on the edge of the wilderness of Bethaven, about thirteen miles northeast of the capital (perhaps Ophrah, the modern Et-Taiyiheh). While there he confined himself to the society of his disciples.

The reason why Jesus waits at Ephraim (54)

"It had become clear to him that his fate would soon be decided: but nothing could be done without the participation of the whole nation, and for that a fitting opportunity would be given in the forthcoming feast of the Passover, when all Israel would again be assembled in the capital. He dared not fall a sacrifice to secret snares of his enemies; and as it was not for him to invoke the miraculous protection of God, he was obliged to take human precaution till his hour should come" (Weiss).

6. *All Watch for Him in Jerusalem* (11:55–57)

The Sanhedrin advertises for him; the people watch for him (55–57)

The time for the Passover was close at hand. Already many from all parts of the country were on their way to the capital to undergo those ceremonial purifications which should make them ready for the feast itself. The sanhedrin had posted up notices to the effect that any one knowing where Jesus was should inform the authorities in order that they might arrest him. The purpose of these notices was doubtless partly to intimidate the people. They certainly quickened their curiosity, for the main topic of conversation among those who stood about in groups in the temple was the likelihood of his coming to the feast. They kept looking for him among the incoming crowds and, as from time to time they gathered in little knots, they asked, "What do you think? That he will keep away from the feast?"

IX

THE THREEFOLD RELATIONSHIP OF CHRIST (12:1–36)

1. *Introductory*

Jesus now to go to the capital

It is impossible to tell just how long Jesus was at Ephraim; probably not many days. The time had now come for his last journey to the capital. The "day" of which he had recently spoken (11:9) was drawing to its

close and he must accomplish what yet remained to be done before the cross should be set up. From the fact that he entered the city from Bethany it is likely that he went from Ephraim to Jericho to join the pilgrims to the feast. This time he was ready to make a public appearance at the festival. In this twelfth chapter we come to the end of the second great division of the Gospel. In events it is linked with the great solemn week which brought the end; in the feelings portrayed it keeps in line with what goes before. It shows us the same mistaken expectations, the same bitter antagonism, the same exceptional devotion. The light is brighter, the shadows deeper. In their striking pictures the author presents the relationship of Christ to his disciples, to the people, and to the outside world. Then follows a review of the antagonism which has now embodied itself in the sentence of the Sanhedrin against Jesus. The first part of the chapter contains a double picture of the position of Jesus, in which he is presented as winning the affection and admiration of men at the very time that he is under the death-sentence of the Sanhedrin. Both pictures have over them the shadow of the hatred of the hierarchy; in both there is the expression of ardent homage.

Place of this chapter in the history

Its contents

A moment's glance at the Synoptics will show that the chronological arrangement of events is not uppermost in the mind of the writer, for he has placed to-

Chronological order not sought; shows rather situation in Judea at time of Passion week

gether scenes from the beginning and from the middle of Passion week. It seems rather to be his purpose to show us more fully the situation in Judea before we enter upon the events of the Passion. Amid the prudent hesitancy of "the Jews" and the favoring enthusiasm of the people Jesus walks and speaks openly. He knows how near the end is. Every scene is quick with tragic interest. There are all through the chapter the touches in description of an eye-witness (see 2, 3, 8, 9, 18, 19, 22).

2. *The Supper in Bethany* (12:1–8)

The news of the coming of Jesus had undoubtedly gone before him so that when he arrived in Bethany preparations were on the way for a banquet in his honor. It is not without significance that Lazarus is especially mentioned. He is the constant reminder of that imperishable truth, "I am the resurrection and the life." The head of Jesus had at this time a price put upon it. Some vivid contrasts are apparent in that guest-room in Bethany. Beside Jesus, doomed to death, sat the evidence of his power over death; Jerusalem in league against him; the very central forces of evil vanquished; a feast over a resurrection at which there was to be an anointing for a burial. The two significant moments of the evening were when Mary anointed the Lord and when Judas spoke.

Six days before the Passover, that is, on Friday evening just before, or very soon after the beginning of the Sabbath (the Jewish day began at six o'clock P.M.), Jesus arrived by the way of Jericho, at Bethany, where he desired to spend the Sabbath quietly with his friends. Bethany was now famous as the place where Lazarus lived, whom Jesus had raised from the dead. Jesus had been expected, and, before his arrival, preparations had been made for a banquet which out of gratitude and for the sake of honoring him, was given him at the house of Simon, the leper. This Simon, who had doubtless experienced the healing touch of the Master, seems to have been a relative of Lazarus and his sisters. So Martha, true to her character, sought to honor the Lord by serving him. Lazarus, as a guest, reclined at the table with Jesus, while Mary, desirous of giving an especial proof of her affection and thankfulness anointed the feet of Jesus by pouring upon them a flask containing a pound (Mk. 14:3) of pure and very costly spikenard and then drying them with her hair. The rich perfume of the spikenard filled the house and led to the tactless, calculating question as to why this costly ointment, worth about fifty dollars, was not sold, and the money given to the poor.

Jesus arrives in Bethany (1)

A supper at Simon's house (2)

Mary anoints the feet of Jesus (3)

Matthew, in his account, attributes this unfeeling question to the disciples, but John, in the light of all he afterward knew, traces its origin to Judas Iscariot, and accounts for it by no disinterested regard, on his part, for the poor, but by his avarice, which had made him, instead of an hon-

Judas asked the "tactless" question (4–6)

est treasurer of the little company of the disciples, a thief purloining from time to time the contributions which were given to his care. Had the ointment been sold the money would have been put into the treasury and so under his thieving hand. Let her alone, said Jesus, let her keep it. Her purpose was to anoint me with it, and in doing this she has virtually anointed me for my burial. You have the poor always with you. There is no lack of opportunity for helping them. I shall not be with you always. That fact justifies this expenditure.

Jesus's rebuke of the question (7)

3. *The Triumphal Entry* (12:9–19)

Keim's estimate

Keim tells us that "in the face of the irritability of his opponents, in the face of the powerful means at their disposal for crushing him with the speed of wind and the force of storm, there remained to him but one chance, but one dreadful weapon—reckless publicity, the conquest of the partially prepared nation by means, not of force, but of idea, by the bold and complete unfurling of the clearly and loudly and—to the popular mind—eloquently speaking banner of that Messiahship the secret of which he had so long hidden within himself and of which he had held possession with growing certainty of victory notwithstanding all he had suffered. He staked his life upon the venture." There is not an iota of evidence in any of the evangelists that Jesus ever changed

his conception of Messiahship. If Keim has said all that can be said of the triumphal entry, it was a poor, foolish, short-sighted venture. The crowd which shouted that day the equivalent of our modern "God save the King" was ready within four days to cry "Crucify him." The glory of the Bethany miracle filled the eyes of the multitude. The narrative keeps that in the foreground. So, too, the tidings of the exasperation of the hierarchy, who were not loved by the people, were spread abroad. It must be death or acceptance of the position they, the people, would give him as their leader. So they thought, why not, then, use this critical moment to compel him to lead them? These are the motives lying behind the action of the multitude. Jesus knew well enough what their conceptions and hopes were. He played no bold game. He acted consistently his part, choosing to ride to the city with no stately pomp nor worldly display. This is the same Messiah whom John has been presenting to us in one chapter after another. The scene is true to the spirit of all the Gospels. Its symbols of peace and its signs of dominion had no quarrel to make with either Jew or Roman, except as righteousness and truth were withstood by evil or falsehood. John wishes us to see this as the disciples saw it when, after the ascension, they looked back upon the strange procession, interpreting it by words from the prophecy of Zechariah, as Jesus meant they should.

The motives of the multitude

Jesus in this scene consistent with himself

Many go out to Bethany to see Jesus; counsel taken also against Lazarus (9–11)

The news of the presence of Jesus, in Bethany, was brought to the city by the caravan with which he had travelled from Jericho. It is not strange, therefore, in view of the eager questioning about him (11:56), that a large company of the Jews—his usual opponents—went out to the nearby village to see both him and Lazarus, whose resurrection from the dead made him an object of the deepest interest. In the case of many of them, "seeing was believing," and they quietly withdrew from among those who were hostile, and in trustful faith cast in their part and lot with Jesus. The discovery of this fact led the chief priests to make plans for putting Lazarus, too, out of the way.

An outline of the story of the triumphal entry

The above words are introductory to the triumphal entry and explain how the company which *followed* Jesus to the city was augmented. It may be well, using the narrative of the other gospels, to give an outline of the story, showing thereby how John's brief account fits into it. On the day after the feast, that is on our Sunday, Jesus determined to go into Jerusalem. He was accompanied by a considerable number of followers, by his disciples, and those who had, on account of the miracle, come to believe on him (11:45; 12:11). They were all not far on the way from Bethany, when word was brought that a great company was on its way from Jerusalem bearing palm branches as those going forth to meet a conqueror. These palms revealed to Jesus the motive

of the multitude and he determined then and there to act out the prophetic description of Zechariah, leaving the people to interpret the scene, if they could, as he wished it. Sending to a friend in Bethphage, a large village just at hand, he asked of him the use of an ass's colt which, not being yet employed, could be spared. Mounting this, Jesus rode toward the city. The crowd which had come out from Jerusalem turned about and went before him. Those following him from Bethany continued on about and behind him. All sang with hopeful rejoicing, "Hosanna. Blessed is he that cometh" (Matt. 21: 1–11; Mark 11: 1–11; Luke 19: 29–44).

The inception of the "Entry" (12, 13)

On the next day, that is, on our Sunday, it was rumored about among the crowds which had come up to the feast that Jesus was coming that day to Jerusalem. The story of the resurrection of Lazarus was upon all lips, and enthusiasm was hourly becoming more intense (13–18). Swiftly the suggestion that Jesus should be welcomed as their king was accepted and group after group of pilgrims turned toward the Bethany road, providing themselves, as they went, with palm branches from the trees by the way. With these they would greet him as Simon Maccabæus once had been when as a conqueror he entered the capital (1 Mac. 13:51).

As they moved along they waved these palms and, adopting the words of welcome given by the priests to the pilgrims to the feast, cried out, "Hosanna: Blessed is he who com-

eth in the name of the Lord!" To which they added in order to make the application of their welcome specific, "Blessed be the King of Israel!" In the prophecy of Zechariah it is written, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold, thy king cometh unto thee; he is just and having salvation, lowly and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt, the foal of an ass" (Zech. 9: 9). This prophecy Jesus acted out literally before the people, leaving to them its interpretation. It is not surprising that they entirely missed it, for the disciples themselves did not at the time understand the significance of it all. Only after the ascension and the consequent enlightenment of the Spirit did they grasp the meaning of the prophecy and of what they had assisted in accomplishing when they joined in the homage that day on the Bethany road. John omits all the details regarding the securing of the colt; he is rather intent upon showing the relation of the triumphal entry to the raising of Lazarus and to the condemnation of Jesus, hence he passes to note first, that that part of the company which was with Jesus when he raised Lazarus (11: 42) bore witness to the fact in all directions, and that on account of this testimony the crowds were moved to go out from Jerusalem to meet Jesus; secondly, that the Pharisees perceived their helplessness in view of the wide-spread enthusiasm for Jesus. "Do you not see," they said to one another, "how helpless you are? The world has gone after him."

Jesus acts out the prophecy of Zechariah (14, 15)

Neither the people nor the disciples understand it (16)

John shows connection of this scene with events before and after (17–19)

4. THE REQUEST OF THE GREEKS (12:20–36)

(1) *Introductory*

The selective character of John's narrative is here emphasized by the presence of this one event out of the many which occurred between the triumphal entry and the Last Supper. The fact that it is the only recorded event from three busy days of teaching and working compels attention. It must have something significant about it. It was the kind of event that needed the full light of Christ's finished work and the spread of Christianity to give it full interpretation. As it stands in the Gospel it requires considerable reading between the lines. The time of it is not distinctly given, but it came probably at the close of the conflict with the Jews. As throwing light upon the request of the Greeks, one should bear in mind the intense constant interest of the people; the impatient malignant watchfulness of the authorities.

The significance of this event for John

It may have been that "these proselytes of the gate," seeing the opposition of the leaders of the people, desired to invite Jesus to take up his residence in some foreign land where he might expect honorable welcome. Be that as it may, opportunity was given to Jesus to set forth the way by which his going out to the world was to be accomplished. His words have over them the sharp-

ly defined shadow of the cross. They set forth what is vitally necessary in order that a Messiah to the Jews shall be a spiritual Messiah to them and to the world. They state what must be in order that a Hebrew temple may become a universal sanctuary. Herein is their significance for the Fourth Gospel. The whole chapter brings out by its chosen pictures both the spiritual nature of the real Messiah and "the promise and potency" of the cross. Perhaps Pauline teaching gave imperishable importance to this third scene in which the Greeks figure. Jesus makes three short addresses which are of a thematic character, thus showing that we have only an outline of what he said. Verses 25, 26 and 28*b* show the hand of the evangelist.

Who these Greeks were (20)

Among the vast concourse of pilgrims who gathered at Jerusalem for the Passover, were many Gentiles who had embraced the Jewish religion. These "proselytes of the gate," as they were called, were allowed the privileges of the outer court of the temple, where in worship they presented their burnt-offerings and thank-offerings. Among these foreigners were at this time some Greeks who, having heard much of Jesus, desired to have an earnest interview with him upon religious matters. Either because they came, perhaps, from a region not far from Bethsaida (Philip's home) or because they recognized his Greek name, they approached him with their desire.

Philip, realizing the exceptional character of this request, consulted Andrew, and they concluded to go with the request to Jesus. The evangelist does not tell us whether or not it was granted, but immediately turns to note the significance of it in the mind of Jesus. Perhaps the Greeks followed the disciples and heard what Jesus said. Their presence is no longer of importance to the evangelist. It is the request of Gentiles that, from a wholly different point of view from that of the opposition of the hierarchy and the persistently mistaken hopes of the people, tells Jesus that his work in Israel is near its end. Gentiles seeking entrance to the kingdom of God! Then the decisive hour *is* come in which through death the Son of Man shall be raised to glory and shall give life to the world. How this shall be and must be is now opened in a brief address in which Jesus speaks, partly in parable and partly in terms of experience, of the way to life's enlargement and glorification.

The significance of the request to Jesus (23)

(2) *First Address: The Way to Life's Enlargement and Glorification* (12:24–26)

I. In Nature—dissolution (24) (of the grain).
   (*a*) Processes: (1) Falling into the ground.
   (2) Actual decomposition.
   (*b*) Result: Bearing much fruit.
II. In personal experience—hating one's life (25).
   NOTE: Here the terms are equivalent to the conditions.

(*a*) Loving one's life; abiding alone.
(*b*) Hating one's life; the outreach of the seed (grain).
Result: One keeps himself for "life eternal."

III. In Christian service—following him.
Results:
(*a*) Where I am there also my servant shall be.
(*b*) Him will I honor.

Jesus shows the necessity of his death (24–26)

I have just spoken of the glorification of the Son of Man. To come to it I must go that way which is alike the way to glorification in nature and in human experience. Truly no seed can bear fruit unless it fall into the ground and die. As long as in the granary it holds its life within the shell, it remains but a single seed—fruitless. Let it be sown and then it perishes as a seed only to be born again in a multitude of grains like itself. And the same law appears in human experience. The man who loves his life, that is, selfishly seeks to gratify simply his own desires and to minister to his own needs, shall find in the end that he is narrowed, warped, and degraded by his selfishness, lost to every spiritual desire and aim; while he who gives up his life freely to the service of others and in self-sacrifice and self-renunciation treats his life in this world as though he hated it, shall guard it unto the blessedness of eternal being. All this holds true with refer-

ence to me, and if any man will serve me let him follow me along this way of self-sacrifice. Where I am there shall he, my servant, be, and because of his service the Father will honor him.

Jesus shrinks from his death, but cannot pray to escape it (27)

Even now at the prospect of what is before me my soul is sorely troubled. What am I to say regarding it? Shall I pray, "Father, save me from this hour"? That would be the cry of nature shrinking from the anguish and horror. But I cannot pray this for steadfastly I have come to this hour with the purpose of self-sacrifice in order to save the world. My prayer is, "Father, glorify thy name! Make complete the manifestation of thy self-sacrificing love—even at the expense of my agony!"

His prayer (28)

The thunder interpreted as an answer (29, 30)

To this prayer came an "Amen" from heaven, for just at that moment a peal of thunder was heard from the clouds which had gathered above. "To the religious sense of the Israelites thunder had ever seemed to be the voice of God (see Ps. 29), and now it appeared to the followers of Jesus like a voice from heaven in which the Father through an angel, gave the Son an answer. Jesus openly declared that he needed no such answer, for he knew that the Father was ever ready to hear him. But he rejoiced that they saw therein the confirmation of his having been heard which the evangelist clothes in the words: I have glorified my name and will glorify it again" (Weiss). Jesus then speaks of the significance of the Passion which is to cost him so much.

(3) *Second Address: The Significance of the Passion* (12:27–33)

I. It is the judgment of the world (31).
II. It is to bring about the casting out of the prince of the world.
III. It will draw all men unto him.

The hour of the Passion critical (31, 32)

As for a while the thought of death troubled the heart of the Master, so now his vision of what the certain issue of his sacrifice was to bring revealed to his hearers not only "the joy that was set before him," but also the "fruit" of which he had spoken. The hour of the Passion would, indeed, be critical. Therein the world would be judged. By rejecting him it would show its true attitude toward God and stand self-condemned. In that hour also was to begin that process of winning men to spiritual truth which should cast out from their hearts the ruler of this world and free them from his destructive dominion. Yes, more than that. The exaltation of Jesus would, by the force of its attractive revelation of the love of God, draw all men to himself as their Lord. In all this the Greeks had an unfailing promise that they should "see him."

John's interpretation (33)

John, in commenting upon the declaration "I, if I be lifted up from (out of) the earth," says that it signified the nature of Christ's atoning death. The sense which he gives to the word glorification includes both the death (with per-

haps a hint here at the elevation upon the cross) and the ascension of Jesus.

(4) *The Perplexity of the Jews and Christ's Treatment of it* (12:34)

The perplexity of the people (34)

Once more the Jews were brought face to face with a contradiction of their current idea of the Messiah. On the basis of their interpretation of the Old Testament (Isa. 9:5–7; Dan. 7:14; Ps. 110:4; 89:41), they believed that when the Messiah came he would reign forever upon the throne of David. Jesus claimed to be the "Son of Man" and they knew also that he wished no less to be the Messiah, but what he had said about being "lifted up from (out of) the earth" could not be true of the Messiah. Who, then, was this one who styled himself the Son of Man?

To this question Jesus gave no answer. Instead he tried once more to have them understand the seriousness of their position. The time for them was nearing its close. Taking once more the symbol of the day and its light he speaks to them of their duty.

(5) *Third Address: Their Duty in Reference to the Light* (12:35, 36)

I. To walk in it (35). Since:
   (*a*) It is to be with them but a little while.
   (*b*) Darkness may overtake them.

(*c*) One walking in darkness knows not whither he is going.

II. To believe in it (36).

Purpose: That they may become sons of light.

The time of opportunity for the Jews near its end (35a)

Paying no attention to their rather sneering question, Jesus told them in a tone of solemn earnestness that the day of their salvation was drawing near to its close. Very soon, like the sun upon the western horizon, the light of truth and life would be gone. As you have the light, walk in a manner suitable to the fact. Seek to understand me and all that I have to tell you of God, of life, and of the future. Do this that that darkness may not overtake you which will come when the divine revelation given you in *me* is gone. In that darkness you will be spiritually as a man who walks in the darkness of the night; he knows not whither he is going. As up to this moment you have the light, treat me as the light; receive the revelation I have given you; yield yourselves to its beneficent, saving power that you may become through me, the light, children of light, that is, disciples delighting in all that I reveal.

Their duty, and their peril if they neglect it (36b)

Jesus hides himself (36c)

Having thus spoken he went away and for a time was hidden from them. For them the light was gone. His last words to the world were those of exhortation and promise.

X

A REVIEW OF JEWISH UNBELIEF BY THE EVANGELIST (12:37–50)

We have in these few verses an epilogue to the second great division of the Gospel, chapters 5–12. It is instructive in two ways. It sets before us the causes of the unbelief which has all along been one of the main subjects of interest in the Gospel, and it shows us how the evangelist gathers together some of the main teachings of the Gospel and puts them into the form of an address. Verses 44–50 are in arrangement the work of the writer of the Gospel. They are introduced by the words, "Jesus cried out and said," but they are not an address of Jesus in its original form. There is no indication of either occasion or locality for the words said to have been spoken. Themes reappear which have been before us in earlier chapters. Too much should not be concluded from all this. The words are not fictions of the evangelist, though their arrangement is. Jesus at one time or another had said them. They are introduced in this concrete way with strict truthfulness as to their source. The purpose in grouping them is to bring out clearly the serious consequences of the unbelief of the Jews. It is a clear instance where subjectivity ap-

The peculiar character of this short section

pears in the use and arrangement of truths spoken on different occasions but made serviceable by arrangement for a specific purpose of the evangelist. The passage naturally falls into two divisions, 37–43 giving us the cause of Jewish unbelief, 44–50 the responsibility for it and its serious consequences.

1. *The Cause* (12:37–43)

The relation of prophecy to the unbelief of the Jews (37–41)

To the evangelist it was clear beyond all question that Jesus was the Messiah. How was it then that his own people, destined by God to have him in their midst, to hear his teachings, and to witness many miracles performed openly before them, would not believe in him? The answer to this question John finds in the relation of prophecy to the whole situation.

As a messenger of God Isaiah could not in his day enlighten a favored but hardened people. His lamentation was, "Who hath believed what we teach?" "To whom has the power of God been revealed?" The reason of his failure was in that bitter process which unbelief had set going; in the outworking of that law in the realm of soul by which the power of seeing is gradually taken from him who will not see. "By abuse of light Nature produces callousness, and what Nature does God does." Isaiah had seen the glory of Christ. If the people turned from his prophetic teaching concerning God, they would surely turn from the

teaching and work of God incarnate. Their unbelief would make it impossible for them to see and turn and be healed. All this Isaiah told. It was not the prediction which caused the future event, but, with something of the power of God, to whom there is no "before" or "after," the prophet looked upon the fact as existent and declared it. It must therefore come to pass.

The kind of faith found among the rulers (42, 43)

Wide-spread and sad as the unbelief of Israel was, there were, nevertheless, even among the rulers many who believed on him. Their faith, however, was in most cases simply intellectual; certainly it was cowardly for, on account of the Pharisees, they refused to confess Jesus openly, fearing that they might be excommunicated from the synagogue. The ultimate reason for their lack of confession was their desire for the approbation of men rather than the approbation of God.

2. *The Seriousness of the Unbelief of the Jews* (12:44–50)

It is a rejection of God (44, 45)

Under the form of an address spoken by Jesus the evangelist aims now to set forth the gravity of the unbelief whose cause he has just been declaring. In the first place it is virtually a rejection of God himself, since faith in Jesus is not faith in him alone, separated from the Father and coming of himself; it is faith in one who is solely an ambassador of God. The spiritual eye can and does see ever

more clearly through his life and thought the nature and purposes of the Father. As a light thus upon God and his relations to men Jesus was come unto the world in order that every one who would accept this light might no longer abide in spiritual darkness. Secondly, their unbelief is virtually a rejection of God's truth, since the truth which Jesus had spoken was not simply his own message but was, all of it, in both matter and form, from the Father. The great central purpose of that message which he was commanded to speak, was eternal life so vital and unique that he had given it just as the Father gave it to him without the slightest alteration. The rejection of such a message entailed a woful judgment. That judgment was not made personally by Jesus. He did not come into the world to condemn it; his purpose was rather to save it. Unbelief, however, will find itself judged and that, too, by the very word which it has rejected. This will be the solemn realization of the last great day.

It is a rejection of God's truth (46, 47)

Unbelief insures a woful judgment (48–50)

JESUS AND HIS DISCIPLES

THE SELF-REVELATION MADE TO FAITH

Chapters 13–17

JESUS AND HIS DISCIPLES

I

THE PURIFICATION OF THE DISCIPLES' FAITH (13)

1. *Introductory*

The change of atmosphere in these chapters

With the beginning of this chapter we enter the fourth division of the Gospel. It is concerned almost entirely with the disciples. The bitter antagonism which is constantly evident in the chapters we have finished passes now, for a season, out of sight. The disappearance of Judas is, indeed, suggestive of its ceaseless activity, but in that upper room where they sat down to supper and where Jesus spoke, one's interest is fixed and fascinated by revelations which present to faith a Messiah worthy of its fullest exercise.

The differences between Synoptics and John

It is well known that a marked difference exists between the Synoptics and John in regard to the time of the Last Supper. The two facts which the Johannine narrative gives us are (1) a supper before the Feast of the Passover; (2) the death of Jesus before the eating by the Jews of the actual Passover. These data seem to be in accord with the accurate history of events.

Indications that John's narrative is right

There are incidental indications in the Synoptics that John's order is really the right one, that is, the carefulness of the Sanhedrin not to arrest Jesus on the feast day (Mk. 14: 2) and the desire to get the bodies down from the cross, presumably, before the beginning of the feast (Mk. 15: 42). As showing that the supper of this chapter is distinct from the regular Passover, the disciples understood Jesus in saying to Judas, "That thou doest, do quickly," to be giving him a command to make the necessary purchases for the feast or to give some of the funds in order to provide a Paschal supper for the poor (Jn. 13: 27–29). The time of the various events we are now to consider may be arranged as follows:

Thursday	Friday [1]
	Judgment given.
	Crucifixion.
	Slaughter of Paschal Lamb.
6 P.M.	
Supper	
Gethsemane	Passover.
Judicial examination	

[1] The day is reckoned from 6 P.M. of Thursday to 6 P.M. on Friday.

"It seems on the whole to be safe to say that if the two accounts are to be harmonized it is not Saint John who will need to be corrected from the Synoptists, but the Synoptists who will have to be corrected by Saint John" (Sanday).

2. *General Introduction to Chapters* 13–17 (13:1)

As introductory to all this portion of the Gospel, the evangelist states that it was before the Feast of the Passover, that is, on the last night of his life, that Jesus, because he knew that the time was close at hand when he must leave this world and go to the Father, expressed to the uttermost his tender love toward those for whom as his own in the world he had all along shown a changeless affection. This crowning expression of love included all that happened that night in that upper room.

3. *The Washing of the Disciples' Feet* (13:2–20)

Jesus's tender thought of his disciples

This acted parable of Jesus is prefaced by the above words which form really an introduction to this whole division of the Gospel. In them is struck the key-note of all the sad but tender strains that fill the chapter immediately following. Instead of being occupied with himself at this critical hour when a terrible death was close upon him, he thinks continually only of the way by which he may serve and help his disciples. Opinions

differ as to the motive of the washing. Was it the dispute of the disciples recorded in Luke 22:24–27? It has been objected that such a dispute was singularly out of place. So it was, but the disciples had shown themselves capable of such contention. Also that John's account "does not recognize it or agree with it" except in so far as the act itself may bear upon it. Luke's statement (vs. 27), "I am among you as he that serveth," points toward this scene, and the fact that Jesus rises from the table seems to demand some such occasion as the dispute would offer. John aims to show the reach of the condescension, rather than the motive of it. The scene has many of the touches of an eye-witness.

John's aim in this narrative

The rivalry of the disciples

The first manifestation of Jesus's love came at the supper. Absorbed, doubtless, in their contention as to who was to be accounted the greater (Luke 22:24) the disciples had taken their places at the table without the customary washing of the road dust from their feet. The spirit engendered by the dispute repudiated any such service. Jesus, desiring to rebuke their pride and to show them that they must never esteem themselves above any service which love required, rose from the table, laid aside his upper garments, girded himself with a towel, and with a basin of water set about the task. As showing the greatness of this loving condescension, we are told that Judas in the blackness of his heart had already adopted the devilish purpose of betraying him, and

The acted rebuke of Jesus (4, 5)

that Jesus performed the service with the full consciousness of his incomparable sovereign position and of his divine origin and destiny.

Peter's protest (6–8a)

Following the order in which they were reclining he came to Peter. The incongruity of the service caused him to cry out a protest. "Dost thou, Lord, wash my feet?" Jesus simply answered, "You do not now comprehend what I am doing, but you shall as soon as I have finished." "Nothing can alter my position," said Peter. "Thou shalt never wash my feet." If I do not wash your feet—if you refuse to allow this manifestation of love from me, but put your pride and self-will between us—then you will have no part with me in the true spirit and work of my kingdom. If that is what you mean, said the impulsive Apostle, then wash not only my feet but my hands and my head. Nay, said Jesus, he who has bathed has no need of doing more than wash his feet after a walk upon the dusty road; he is otherwise wholly clean. In these words Jesus advanced to the spiritual import of what he was doing. Peter had already made that surrender of himself which we call conversion. He needed not to be reconverted. In God's sight he was justified, wholly clean. The washing of the feet symbolized rather the putting away of such stains as the pride which made necessary the loving act of Jesus.

Jesus's rebuke to Peter (8b, 9)

Jesus explains his act (10)

Jesus speaks of Judas (11)

Turning to the disciples he said, You are all, in this sense, clean except one. He alas! has not bathed; has never surrendered himself to me. John explains that Jesus knew

who should betray him, and the word was one of merciful warning. The disciples, intent upon what he had said to them, seem not to have grasped the meaning of what was said for the ears of Judas.

His injunction to his disciples (12–17)

After he had finished the washing he put on his garments, and taking his place again at the table, he asked them if they perceived the meaning of his act. You call me Teacher and Lord. That is right; I am. If, then, I, your Lord and Teacher, wash your feet, you ought to wash each other's feet. I do not mean that you are to follow my example simply in the external form of it, but rather that you should imitate its spirit and in the self-forgetting ministry of love constantly serve each other. The principle is so vital (Jesus used it four times in the course of his teachings, Matt. 10: 24; Lk. 6: 40; Jn. 13: 16; 15: 20) that I cannot impress the fact too earnestly upon your minds, that a servant is not greater than his lord nor a messenger greater than he who sends him. If, therefore, I, your Lord and Teacher, have shown you the principle of self-abnegating service, you should in that spirit serve one another.

Jesus again alludes to Judas (18, 19)

It is well to know and admire such principles, but the real blessing comes only to him who practises them. As I think of the happiness of spirit that will come to you through such humble, loving service I am again compelled to make one exception. I know the character of those whom I chose to be apostles, and with one of them my teaching and personal intercourse have been of no avail. He has

steadily pursued his selfish purposes, despite my spiritual concern for him. His obduracy has but brought to light the divine purpose (pictured in Ps. 40:9) back of my choice, namely, that one who has been received into daily intimate intercourse (eating my bread) shall turn in brutal malice against me. From henceforth I shall lay aside all reserve and speak freely to you about all this, before the treachery comes to fruition, in order that its success may but strengthen your faith that I am the Messiah.

After this brief digression regarding Judas, Jesus returned to his former theme (vs. 16) and solemnly assured them that the humble living service in which they were to imitate him would make them really interpeters of their Master, yea, more, of God himself, to men—for, as "the servant is not greater than his master, so also he is not less" (Godet).

4. *The Dismissal of Judas* (13:21–30)

Jesus proceeds to direct dismissal of Judas

Jesus had given the false disciple clear indications of his understanding of the treacherous purpose he was entertaining. They were given undoubtedly in order to invite Judas to depart, as Jesus wished to be alone with his disciples for a while. Judas did not so receive them and now the Master proceeded to direct dismissal. The account of the Fourth Gospel comes here into parallelism with Matthew 26:21–26; Mark 14:18–21; Luke 22:

Relation of Synoptic and Johannine accounts of banishment of Judas

21–23. The anxious attitude of the disciples shows how little they really understood Judas. They certainly did not turn at once to him as the only man capable of such a dark deed. Judas had acted his part well. The account in Matthew 26: 21–26 presents some difficulty as compared with John. Instead of solving it, as Wendt does, by a "progress from a primary to a secondary Synoptic tradition and thence to the Johannine version" we should prefer to consider the account of the Synoptics as condensed, presenting in a few sentences what is given in John in true historic unfolding. Sanday's words are worth noting, for he says truly that in this episode of the dismissal of the traitor: "The Fourth Gospel is the fullest, the most minute, the most life-like, and the most intelligible. It is simply impossible that any one but an eye-witness should have given in this way the varying situations of that critical hour when Jesus determined to banish from the upper room the one spirit that was not in harmony with him and his aims." As Godet remarks, John's account is "luminous, particular, and exact."

Jesus says that one shall betray him; all anxious (21–23)

In his agony of heart over such desperate treachery Jesus decided to let the disciples know what was distressing him. He, doubtless, hoped that the distinct declaration of his knowledge to them all would induce Judas to leave, and so he said solemnly to them, "One of you shall betray me."

Despite the hints which they had already received the announcement filled them with bewilderment and anxiety. They do not seem to have suspected Judas and so they asked, Judas joining them in the question, Lord, is it I? Jesus did not in all likelihood further embitter Judas by such a direct answer as Matthew gives (26: 25). The answer in his gospel is rather a summary of the course of events given us here. The exposure was very quiet and, at first, known only to John. It was the custom to recline at the table with the left arm upon a pillow and the feet stretched backward so that the right arm was free. Reclining next to Jesus on his right was the disciple who describes himself as "the one whom Jesus loved," that is, John. Peter reclining next and thinking that the beloved disciple was sure to know, nodded to him knowingly and whispered, "Tell us who it is of whom he is speaking." John, however, was as much in the dark as the rest of them, but, leaning back upon Jesus's breast, he asked him who it was. Not wishing even now to expose the wretched, deluded disciple to the whole company, and at the same time desiring to give him an occasion to depart, Jesus whispered to John, "The one to whom I shall give this morsel after I have dipped it in the sauce is the man." Thereupon he handed the dipped morsel to Judas Iscariot, Simon's son. Judas had been furtively watching all that took place—the whispering of Peter and John and of John and Jesus—and his guilty conscience readily construed the act of Jesus as the sign of his exposure. He had made re-

Jesus tells John who it is (24–26)

Judas leaves the room (27–30)

treat for himself impossible. There was nothing now but to go on in his desperate way. He determined to act at once. According to a Jewish manner of speaking, then and there Satan took control of him. As there was now no need of further consideration or delay, Jesus bade him do what he was determined to do as quickly as possible. Judas left the room. No one of the disciples, not even John, understood this command of Jesus—some of them, indeed, thought that, since Judas was the treasurer of the little company, he had been told to make some purchases for the feast or to make some provision for charity. Darkness had meanwhile, with the suddenness usual in the East, fallen upon nature. Its coming, under the circumstances, was deeply impressive.

The disciples do not understand his departure (28, 29)

II

THE DISCOURSES (13:31–14:31)

1. *Introductory*

General character of these chapters

It has been often noted how involved the structure of these chapters is. Different subjects are not once for all and completely handled. They "cross and entangle one another." So much is this so that it has been said that clearness demands that the material be gathered under specified heads and then interpreted. This method would have the advantage of securing unity and

compactness; it would, however, break in upon the character of the address and in some measure obscure the very naturalness of the reminiscences as they now stand. For, first of all, it must be remembered that we have here the report of conversations and short talks which occupied perhaps two hours or more. More than once, in all probability, Jesus or the disciples came back to the same subject. It would appear now in one connection, now in another. It is an unlikely conception of the ongoing of affairs on that memorable evening to suppose that Jesus delivered a long formal address having complete logical arrangement. Any such view makes it easy to look for "displacements," but it should not be forgotten that the aim of these chapters is to give *reminiscences* which shall make clear the "glory" of Jesus. We are thus brought close to the critical question regarding these chapters: How far do they bear the Johannine impress? Do they contain the *ipsissima verba* of the Master? In order to an intelligent answer some considerations must be borne in mind: (1) The style of the four chapters is uniform with that of the remainder of the book. We have here no more variety in manner of address than in chapters 1 or 5. In so far a Johannine impress is certainly evident. (2) Questions about *ipsissima verba* are more or less associated with some form of a mechanical theory of inspiration. If after fifty years the Holy Spirit gave the Apostle a definite memory

Important considerations regarding these chapters

of the exact words of Jesus, then, of course, the questions given above are easily answered, except as we are at a loss to know why the Johannine style is assumed, for it is surely present. The fundamental question then is: Does the Holy Spirit work after this fashion? Does he not rather work in accordance with psychological laws? Does he not use given temperaments, peculiar training, and given circumstances in order to secure the expression of truth as he will have it? And is truth less truth because it thus comes through the processes of human thought? If so, might it not be just to conclude that the Holy Spirit is of little service in all human utterances? Among the many things said that night in the upper room some were impressed upon the mind of the meditative Apostle. These chapters show that he did not recall a great variety of subjects; nor does he remember a great deal about each subject. In the fourteenth chapter nearly all that he does remember centres about the questions asked. It is not improbable that more questions were asked and that a process of selection is here to be supposed. Soon after that sad night came the resurrection, and light fell upon *all* the words Jesus had spoken. Through meditation and experience the Holy Spirit led the Apostle into the innermost meaning of the teaching of the Master. John is not a short-hand reporter, nor does the Spirit make him one; he is an interpreter. Does interpretation always require *ipsissima verba*? The

They do not contain a great variety of subjects

John not a reporter but an interpreter

historical character of the scene, questions, and personages is clear enough. The whole framework of the discourses is unquestionably true to fact, and the words themselves are true to truth. Why should we seek to go further than this? We have not sufficient data, in most cases, to separate the Johannine interpretation from the truth in its original form, but in all cases we have the truth. It is to be noted that all the truth here given roots itself in the divine-human personality of Jesus. It is not the clothing of an idea; it is the interpretation of an unique, historical person. Without *him* it were simply impossible; it is beyond human invention. It requires Jesus, the Jesus of the Synoptics and of the earlier scenes of this Gospel, in order to its adequate explanation both as to origin and character. It is only in form and arrangement, not in substance, that we find evidences of Johannine impress. In these discourses we have "the mind of Christ seen through the medium of one of the first and closest of his companions."

Their truth the interpretation of an historical person

Taking this whole portion of the Gospel as one, we shall consider it in five parts, each of which is dominated by a special purpose.

2. *The Announcement of His Departure* (13:31–38)

Jesus realizes that the end is near (31, 32)

As soon as Judas had gone out, the realization of the nearness of the end came upon Jesus anew, and in words which have in them a note of triumph, he said to his disciples: Now my work on earth is virtually finished. In all that I have said and done, as the Son of Man, I have been acknowledged and accepted by the Father. That is my glorification. In that God has been made manifest in my self-sacrificing obedience and devotion, he, too, has been glorified. He now will glorify me in taking me up into complete divine fellowship with himself, and this he will do straightway. Little children, I am to be with you yet only for a short time. You will seek for me in the coming days of need and conflict. Now, I can say to you only, as for a very different reason I once said to the Jews, "Whither I am going, ye cannot come." You must for a time continue my ministry on earth and witness to my name. For all that time of discipleship I give you a commandment in regard to loving one another which is new both in its scope and its motive. It is this: that you should love one another, *as I have loved you*. If you love one another in this way all men will know that you are my disciples.

Having glorified God, he is to be with them only a little while (33)

His command to the disciples who must remain (34, 35)

Peter's questions (36–38)

Simon Peter, struck with the word of Jesus that they could not go whither he was going, asked, "Lord, whither art thou going?" In reply Jesus but repeated his former declaration. "Whither I am going you cannot follow me

now; later you shall." Peter, thinking Jesus spoke as he did because he thought him wanting in courage, asked, "Why can I not follow thee now? I will lay down my life for thy sake." "You will lay down your life for my sake?" Alas! even in this, said Jesus, you cannot follow me now, for before the morning comes you will have denied me thrice.

3. *Comfort for Disciples Perplexed and Saddened by the Thought of His Departure* (14:1–31)

The method of this chapter

In this portion the words of Jesus are given for the most part in answer to questions. The thought advances by way of a difficulty suggested by one or another of the disciples. In 13:33 Jesus told them that he had still only a little while with them and they cannot follow him "now." This brings him to the first promise.

(1) *The Promise of Reunion* (14:1–11)

They must believe him and out of their faith draw abiding comfort when he tells them:

(*a*) That in the Father's house are "many mansions" (2).
(*b*) That he is going to prepare a place for them (2).
(*c*) That he will come and take them to himself (3).
(*d*) That they know the way (4).

This last statement brings out a demurrer from Thomas (5), to which Jesus makes reply by saying:

(I) I am the way (to the Father).
  (*a*) By being the truth.
  (*b*) By being the life.

(II) I am the only way to the Father, hence,
  (*a*) Knowing him is knowing the Father.
  (*b*) From that time they knew and had seen the Father.

The assertion just made (*b*) perplexes Philip, who doubtless is thinking of some vision such as came in the time of the Old Testament, and he immediately asks to be shown the Father (8). Jesus meets this by repeating his former statement and then he makes a distinct advance upon it in this way:

He that hath seen me hath seen the Father (9), since the Father is in him and he is in the Father (10). The proof of this is in:

(*a*) His words.
(*b*) His works.

Upon the basis of this assertion Jesus makes appeal to faith in view of,—

(*a*) His union with the Father evident in life and word (11 *a*).

(*b*) His works (11 *b*).

It was not only Peter's heart that had been dismayed and stricken by the words of Jesus about his departure to a place whither they could not now follow him. They were all deeply troubled. To dispel their sadness and perplexity Jesus said: "Let not your heart be distracted by anxiety and grief. Put your faith in God, whose promises never fail, and in me, through whom those promises are brought to sure fulfilment. In the home where my Father dwells there are many abiding-places. Where God is, there is abundance of room for those who love him. If there were any doubt about this I would have told you,—the very reason of my going is to make ready a place for you—that is, by death, a resurrection, and the Spirit to open the way for you to heaven. If I go thus to prepare a place for you, I am as surely coming again, to receive you into that intimate spiritual union with myself which has its ultimate glorious issue in your being with me where I am. And you know the way whither *I* am going—the way of self-sacrifice and spiritual achievement."

The attitude they must take toward his departure (1, 2a)

The purpose of his going (2c)

He is coming to them again (3, 4)

"Nay," said Thomas, "all we know is that thou art going; we do not know whither. How then can we know the way?" In his reply Jesus substitutes "the Father" for "the Father's house," making the goal personal, and then proceeds to show that the way thereto is also personal. "I am the way," he said to Thomas, and for two reasons, because I am the truth and because I am the life. All that is necessary for a man to do and to be in order to come into

The perplexity of Thomas (5)

Jesus the way to the Father (6)

fellowship with God is revealed by me. Nor does this truth by its lofty requirements appear as a discouraging ideal, for I am also the life, the power, the vital force which makes the actualization of this spiritual truth possible. Hence no man comes to God except through me. I am the exponent of the nature of things spiritually considered. Unless a man seeks to make actual in his life that which in all its spiritual fulness I am, he cannot come to God. And so, if you had come to know me in the various revelations I have made to you, you would have known the Father. From this time on you, after all that I have so plainly told you, will know him and will have seen him, whenever you see me.

Seeing him is seeing the Father (7)

Philip's perplexity (8)

Do you mean to say that we have seen God? was the wondering question of Philip. Would that it were true! Would that we might have some theophany such as came to Moses, or Elijah! Lord, show us the Father in some such way as that and we shall then be contented. In sadness Jesus replied, "Have I been with you for so long a time and yet you have not come to know me, Philip?" The highest, truest conception of God is that he is love and holiness rather than power manifesting itself in some form of physical glory. A holy and loving life reveals his essential character more fully than is possible in any material theophany. For just this reason, the man who, like you, has seen me in all these days of familiar intercourse has had a clear vision of the Father. How then can you say, "Show us the

How they have seen the Father in him (9–10b)

Father?" Do you not believe that the Father and I are in the closest communion, so that I find all my impulses and aims in him, and that he expresses his wisdom and power, as far as they concern human relations, through me? The words which I speak are not utterances of my own making. They are the expression of divine, eternal principles, the very truth of God. So, too, my works have not their source in me; they, too, are the exhibition through me of God's loving, beneficent will.

The character of his words and works (10c, 11)

Turning to the disciples Jesus said in substance: You have been long enough with me to believe me when I say that I am in the Father and the Father in me. My word for you needs no credentials. If it does, there are my works, accept them.

The mention of works as showing his intimate relation to the Father, brings Jesus back to his original purpose of comforting the disciples, from which he had been diverted by the questions of Thomas and Philip.

(2) *The Promise of Power* (14: 12–17)

The power is to issue from faith and will be manifested as follows:

(*a*) Greater works they shall do because of his departure.

(*b*) Their prayers in his name shall be mighty (13, 14b) that the Father shall be glorified (14a).

(*c*) To them who obey his commandments another advocate shall come, the Spirit of truth (15, 16).

(1) The world cannot receive this advocate (17a).

(2) The disciples shall have him with them and in them continually (17b).

The greater works which his disciples shall do (12b)

Let me tell you in all earnestness, he said, that whosoever believeth in me, thereby bringing himself into vital relations with me, shall do the very works I do—healing and helping men—also works of a higher nature, such as the winning of men from Judaism and paganism, the building up of the Church, and the leavening of the world with Christian truth. These "greater works" you can accomplish because I go to the Father, so that at his right hand I shall have unlimited power with which to work in you and through you. Hence, whatever you ask, as being one with me in spirit and purpose, I will do in order that through my oneness with the Father and your efficiency through me the Father may be ultimately glorified. If you ask anything of me, as being one with me in spirit and purpose, I will grant it. More than this, I will ask the Father and he will give you, when I am gone, another Paraclete[1] to be with you forever, to act "as a support in moments of weakness, a counsellor in the difficulties of life, or a consoler in affliction."

The reason why they can (12b)

Their power in prayer (13, 14)

Another Paraclete will come; his work (15–17)

[1] Both Advocate and Comforter.

The condition of his coming, however, will be that you shall keep my commandments, as evidence that you love me. This Paraclete is the Spirit of truth. Truth is the reality for which he exerts all his activity, and that, too, the truth as it is in me which he will make clear to you. The unbelieving world cannot receive him for it has no sympathy with him and consequently does not see him in any of his external manifestations nor does it learn to know him by personal experience. On the contrary, you are coming to know him because he abideth with you, making you the object of his work, and later he shall be in you (at Pentecost).

All these precious promises left them still with a deep sense of what their bereavement was to be, and so Jesus in a third promise speaks more definitely of his coming to them. The nature of this promise appears in the following:

(3) *The Promise of Personal Manifestation* (14: 18–26)

This refers directly to his appearance to them after his resurrection. The resurrection, however, is received as the point of contact for that spiritual communion which it made possible. In regard to this personal manifestation:

(1) He tells them of the time of its realization after a little while (19a). His resurrection life guarantees their eternal life (19b).

(2) He tells them that this personal manifestation will throw light upon the mystical union of Father, Son, and disciples (20).

(3) He tells them what is the condition on their part for the continuance of that intercourse begun at the resurrection (21).

Judas, like Philip, has his mind fixed upon another form of manifestation. He is thinking of a Messiah who shall be visible to friends and enemies alike; hence his question: "How is it that we and not the world are to see thee?" (22). Jesus replies in substance: Love, shown in obedience, is the necessary condition of spiritual revelation. Where this love is, fellowship with the Divine reveals even more clearly both the Father and the Son (23, 24). All this shall be made clear by the Spirit.

He is coming to them soon (18, 19)

I will not leave you as orphans. I am coming to you in all the reality of a resurrection. After a brief time the world shall see me no more. By the cruel hand of hatred I shall be taken from its light. But *you* shall see me as I come in the glory of the resurrection. Upon my resurrection life shall be based the certainty of your eternal life. Then, too, in that day, when you shall soon see me again, you will come to know more clearly than is possible to you now the intimate spiritual union which exists between me

The revealing light from this resurrection (20, 21)

and the Father and between me and you. The proof of that spiritual union on your part will be your love for me, showing itself in constant obedience to my commands. Love lives so entirely for another that it finds in that other the determining motive for its whole life. He who loves me in this way is "in me" as I am in the Father. I, too, will love him and in my love make myself known to him through inner experiences as well as external evidences, so that from the time of my return at the resurrection on through all the days to come, each and all of you shall know that you have not been left as orphans in the world.

The perplexity of Judas (not Iscariot) (22)

Judas (not Iscariot) thinking of the hope so firmly fixed in the Jewish mind that the Messiah would appear in bodily glory before the whole world in order to judge the Gentiles and to restore supremacy to the Jews, asked, "What has happened leading you to change your plan, so that you are to manifest yourself to us alone and not to the world?" Jesus does not answer Judas directly, but by repeating and developing the statement which called the question forth.

The test of love and the outcome of love (23)

If a man loves me he will keep my commandments: obedience is the infallible test of affection. To such obedience not only does the Father respond with affection, but we both will come to him who displays it and we will abide with him. To love me, to obey my commandments, to be loved of the Father, these are the conditions of my manifesting myself. They are individual, personal, spiritual. You can thus see why I do not manifest myself to the world.

The conditions of Christ's manifestation (24)

The world does not love me and so does not keep my commands. Virtually it disobeys God himself, since my word which you hear is not mine but the word of him who sent me. How, therefore, can I manifest myself to the world?

The Spirit will complete his teaching (25, 26)

These instructions and consolations I have spoken to you while yet abiding with you. They are all that I can give you now, but the Paraclete, that is, the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send to represent me and continue my work, will teach you all things that you need to know above what I have said and will bring to your remembrance all that I have told you in order that you may have a full understanding and appreciation of its meaning. In these words Jesus began to say farewell, and he now gives them his bequest of peace.

(4) *His Bequest of Peace* (14: 27–30)

(*a*) This peace is his peace.
(*b*) This peace is given not after the manner of the world's giving.

The thought is now brought back to the opening words of the chapter (27c) and from another point of view reasons are given for these sentences of exhortation.

(*a*) The Father is greater.
(*b*) His words have prepared them for what is to come (28).

(c) That the world may know that he loves the Father (30).

The gift of his peace (27)

And now in the words of men as they take leave of each other, I say to you, "Peace be with you!" But the peace I leave with you is not that of the empty salutations of every-day leave-taking; it is *my* peace—the peace of soul which amid conflict and trouble has its source in my trust in God and in my future. That is my peace and I give it to you, through your unshadowed faith in me, not as the world gives, thoughtlessly, conventionally, and therefore with little meaning, but really, efficaciously, truly. In view of it and of all I have said to you, I pray you not to let your hearts be distracted by anxiety and grief, neither let them be afraid.

They are to be glad, not sorrowful (28)

Rather ought you to be glad, for you heard me say to you that I am going away and then coming again to you. If your thoughts had not been concentrated on your own loss, but rather on the fulfilment of my work and the enlargement of my power, you would have rejoiced in my going to the Father because the Father enthroned in his unchangeable glory is greater than I. And I have told you of my departure and what is involved in it before it actually takes place in order that when it does take place your faith may remain sure. I shall not talk much longer with you, for Satan—the prince of the world of sin—is coming in the person of the traitor Judas. He will find nothing in me upon which he can lay claim, but in order that the world may

His words are to fortify their faith (29–31)

know that I love the Father and do as he has commanded, I surrender my life. Arise, let us go hence to meet the issue.[1]

III

THE RELATION OF CHRIST'S DISCIPLES TO HIM AND OF THE WORLD TO THEM (15:1–16:6)

1. *Introductory*

I. The relation of Christ's disciples to him (15: 1–17)

A. Set forth, *in general*, under the metaphor of the vine. The teachings are (1–4):

[1] Considerable discussion has been given to the bearing of these last words upon all that follows. Did they all leave the upper room and then in some spot outside the city hear the words recorded in chapters 15–17? Or did they simply arise from the table and remain standing in the room while Jesus continued speaking? Or have the words been misplaced and should they come after chapters 15–17? Either supposition in no way affects the interpretation. It is not unlikely that Jesus, crowded in mind with last thoughts, may have continued speaking after they arose from the table. It is also probable that John, with no exact remembrance of what was said before or after the rising from the supper, has gathered together thoughts that might be arranged differently. We are dealing with *reminiscences*. The statement in 18:1, "Having said these things, Jesus went out with his disciples over the brook Kedron," seems to make the upper room the scene of all that is recorded in chapters 15–17. There is no general agreement as to when chapters 15–16 are to be placed if taken out of their present position. Some critics place them between verses 20 and 21 of chapter 13; others, after 31a of the same chapter; still others, between verses 35 and 36 of chapter 13.

(1) The oneness of Christ and his disciples—in me.
(2) The expected issue of that oneness —fruit.
(3) The secret of fruit-bearing—abiding in him.

B. Made *specific* by direct word to the disciples, giving (5–17)
(1) The issue of "abiding" or of being "taken away" (5, 6).
(2) The interpretation of abiding (7–10).
(3) The blessings accompanying this abiding:
(*a*) Power in prayer (7–16b).
(*b*) His joy (11).
(*c*) His friendship (14, 15).

II. The relation of the world to the disciples (15: 18–16: 6). It hates them as it has hated him (18).
(1) Reasons for this hatred.
(*a*) The very opposition of nature (19).
(*b*) Ignorance of the Father (21).
(2) The inexcusableness of this hatred.
(*a*) The word he had spoken left the world without excuse.
(*b*) The works he had done put them in the same position.

(*c*) They (i. e., the world) really hated without cause.

(*d*) The Holy Spirit and the disciples shall bear witness to the fact that this hatred of the world is even inexcusable (26, 27).

(3) The manifestation of this hatred—the disciples shall be put out of the synagogues and even killed (16: 2).

(*a*) The motive behind all this (2).

(*b*) The real reason for clear action.

The consolation which with all this Jesus seeks to give his disciples appears constantly in the rich promise made to them and in such direct words of cheer as are found in 15: 14–16 and 16: 1, 4.

The occasion for the following words about the vine must be sought for in the situation. Despite all that had been said the disciples were doubtless deeply anxious, and it is to meet again this anxiety that Jesus tells them that their union with him in coming days will be as the branches with the vine—vital and productive. Various suggestions have been offered as to why Jesus emphasized this particular figure—the cup of the supper containing the fruit of the vine, a vine by the window, vineyards upon the hill slopes outside the city, the golden

vine of the Temple Court. It is most likely that the vine as the image of Israel, a figure familiar to them all, was suggested by some visible reminder. Weiss contends that John's allegory is but the working over by the evangelist of a parable of the vine in which Jesus originally was speaking of the Kingdom of God which he was planting in Israel. John adapts it to the setting forth of personal relationship to Christ.

2. *The Relation of Christ's Disciples to Him* (15:1–17)

You are familiar with the vine as a symbol of Israel. The Psalmist, you remember, speaks of "the vine which God brought out of Egypt" (80: 8), and Jeremiah laments that the "noble vine" of the Lord's planting had turned "into the degenerate plant of a strange vine" (2:21). Israel is not the veritable vine of God; I am—I, and the branches that live in me. I as "the life-principle of humanity, and you living in and through me, constitute the true Israel of God." My Father is the owner and cultivator of this vine; it is under his providential care. He is constantly seeking for fruit, that is, for the qualities and graces of a spiritual life, and so he carries on in a twofold way the culture of the vine. Every branch (in me) that does not bear fruit, showing by its fruitlessness that it has but an external connection and no vital union, he takes away.

What the vine is the symbol of (1)

The culture of this vine (2, 3)

Every branch bearing fruit he prunes of useless shoots that it may bring forth more fruit. Let this not make you anxious. On account of the revelation of spiritual truth which I have made to you and which you have accepted, you are clean, that is, in a fit condition to bear fruit; see to it that you keep in vital union with me. Let your whole hope and aim centre in me and then I will abide in you as spiritual life and energy. As a branch cannot bear fruit of itself, without any connection with the vine, so you will fail of any spiritual achievement unless you keep in fellowship with me. This one condition is absolutely necessary, since I am the vine and you are the branches. Much fruit can result only from an abiding union of branch and vine; apart, the branch has no power at all. If any man gives up fellowship with me he may see the issue of his life pictured in the fate of the severed branch, which, having been cast out, withers away and with other withered branches is gathered and cast upon the burning heap of vine-prunings. Away from Christ, all interest in spiritual realities dies out and the soul at last is given over to the ruin of sin. If, on the contrary, you keep in fellowship with me, and my sayings, being continually the subject of your meditation, become your guide and inspiration, then you shall through prayer obtain an enlarging fruitfulness, for whatsoever desires born of such inspiration you bring to the Father, shall be granted. In this great fruitfulness is my Father pre-eminently glorified as well as in the fact that

Vital union with him indispensable (4, 5)

The fate of the fruitless branch (6)

The outcome of abiding in the vine (7, 8)

you are thus becoming ever more completely my disciples. The true bond of the moral world is love, and the condition of maintaining it is obedience to its righteous demands. With such a love as the Father has shown toward me, I have loved you. Maintain the sacred bond between us by keeping my commandments, just as I have maintained it between the Father and myself by keeping his commandments.

The true bond of the moral world (9–11)

The deep abiding joy of my life has come from the consciousness of my Father's love and from the keeping of his commandments. I have spoken thus to you about abiding in me and in my love in order that you might have a realization of the joy that is continually mine, and that your realization might be made ultimately complete. My one all-embracing commandment to you is to love one another as I have loved you. And if you ask what is the possible extent of such love, then I say that there is no more that love can do than to lay down life for friends. To die as a sacrifice for those we love is full proof of affection. I am about to give you this highest proof of my friendship; your friendship for me will be evidenced in your willingness to do whatever I command you. I shall speak to you no longer as servants, because a servant executes commands with little knowledge of their reason and purpose; he is simply an instrument for their accomplishment. *You*, on the contrary, are my friends, because I have made known to you the mind and will of the Father. What is more, you did not choose me, but I out of love for you chose you to be my

The one great commandment and its extent (12, 13)

They are his friends if they do his commands (14, 15)

He has chosen them and they shall be equipped for the service of love (16)

apostles, and I have appointed you to go forth into the world as my messengers and in independent spiritual activity bear that fruit which shall remain. I have also put you in a position to obtain from the Father whatsoever you may ask for the furtherance of my work in the world. In spirit, aim, and result the work is all of it the expression of love. All my instructions, therefore, are summed up in the commandment which I give you, to love one another.

3. *The Relation of the World to the Disciples* (15:18–16:6)

The "world" will hate them (18–19)

You will find, however, outside of the circle in which this unifying and ennobling love prevails, a bitterly hostile unity, the unbelieving world—dominated by a hatred of all that is spiritual. Naturally it will hate you, but for your comfort and strength let me remind you that this "world" hated me, as you know, before it hated you. If you were in sympathy with its spirit and aims it would love you, in the sense of loving in you what is to its own advantage, but because you are not, but have been chosen out of it to a life for God, it hates you. Be mindful of what I recently said to you, that a servant is not greater than his lord. If they of the world have persecuted me, your Teacher and Lord, they will also persecute you. If some, turning their backs courageously upon the world, have obeyed my word, there will be some who will obey your word. In as far as you are identified

It will treat them as it has treated him (20)

with me, your experience will be identical with mine. Be not dismayed, it is for my sake, and the underlying reason of it all is the world's ignorance of the true character and purposes of him who sent me. If I had not come as the true Messiah and told them what God's holy will for men is, they would not have had upon them the sin which comes from refusing light. Now they are inexcusable. Their hatred of me is virtually a hatred of God. Likewise they would have been without guilt if I had not wrought among them the works of the true Messiah, such works as no other has done. Their guilt lies in the fact that they have seen in those works the majesty and mercy of God and yet they have hated both me and my Father. This, however, is not to be wondered at, but has happened in accord with the word in their law, "They hated me without a cause." And when, after my departure, the Spirit comes whom I will send to you from the Father—the Spirit whose whole business is to interpret and enforce the truth and who goes forth from the Father upon this mission—he, as opposed to this Christ-hating world, will bear witness concerning me, and you, too, will bear witness because you have been with me from the beginning of my Messianic activity. Thus shall the hatred of the world ever be inexcusable. I have given you all these warnings and consolations in order that when persecution comes you may not be caused to stumble.

The reason of the world's hatred (21, 22a)

The guilt and inexcusableness of the world's hatred (22b–27)

How this hatred will manifest itself (16: 1–3)

Those hating you will expel you from the synagogue. Nay, more, there is an hour coming wherein whosoever

puts you to death will think that he is offering a service unto God. And they will do these things because they have not, in all the opportunities given them, come to know either the Father or me. But, not to dwell on details, I have told you this much in order that when the time comes you may remember that I told you and thus have your faith strengthened. At the beginning I did not speak to you of my departure, of the coming of the Paraclete, of the principle from which the hatred of the world would spring and of your way to overcome it, because I was yet with you. But now I am going away to him who sent me and no one of you asks me whither I am going. No one needs to ask it, for you know, but because of all I have said to you your hearts are filled with grief.

His warnings are to fortify faith (4–6)

IV

THE MISSION OF THE SPIRIT (16:7–15)

I. To the world.
   (1) To convict it of sin because it does not believe in Christ (9).
   (2) To convict it of righteousness because Christ is gone to the Father (10).
   (3) To convict it of judgment because the prince of this world is judged (11).

II. To the disciples.

(1) To guide into all the truth (13). Since:

(*a*) He shall not speak of himself but

(*b*) He shall speak only what he shall hear and

(*c*) He shall declare things that are to come.

(2) To glorify Christ.

Since:

He shall take of that which is Christ's and declare it unto them. In so doing he shall take of that treasure of truth which the Father possesses —all of which belongs to Christ.

The advantage to them of his departure (7)

Strange as it may seem to you, I am speaking the truth to you when I tell you that it is really to your advantage and not to your loss that I go away, for, if I do not, the Paraclete[1] will not come to you. If I go, I will send him to you. Thereby, in exchange for my limited, bodily presence, you will gain the blessing of my spiritual presence—always and everywhere with you. Power will be given you to use my word and I shall become the divine life-centre of all who will believe. Both to you and to the world the Spirit will be a mighty, influential power. Let me tell you what he will do. When he is come he will press home upon the

The mission of the Spirit to the world (8–11)

[1] The Spirit, who is both comforter and advocate.

thoughts of men the great spiritual facts of sin, righteousness, and judgment. To the mind and *conscience* of the world he will make clear what the truth is regarding them and how wrong have been man's general conceptions and judgments; in a word, he will convict the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. In each case he will give the fundamental reason of the conviction. Concerning sin, because men do not believe in me, that is, because they refuse to accept the spiritual and in unbelief turn away from that which alone can make them God-like,—self-surrender to the divine will. The sin conditioning all others is rejection of the spiritual. Concerning righteousness, because I go to the Father and you behold me no more. This "going to the Father" not only vindicates the righteousness of Jesus as against the judgment of his crucifiers, but it brings to a close that life in which righteousness both in relation to God and man has been perfectly exhibited. Henceforth there can be no other standard of righteousness than this, completed on earth and acknowledged in heaven. To it the Spirit will make appeal and thereby make clear to the world the utter inadequacy, if not the perversion, of all of its conceptions of righteousness. Concerning judgment, because the prince of this world has been judged. My death will seem like a victory for all the forces of evil, but the resurrection and ascension will show that it was the defeat of the prince of this world. Thereby his judgment, begun in the temptation, will be completed and made final

Concerning sin (9)

Concerning righteousness (10)

Concerning judgment (11)

and the Holy Spirit will ever disclose to men "the greatness of the visible drama consummated on the cross."

The Spirit's mission to the disciples (12–15)

Such will be the mission of the Paraclete to the world, but his work will not be confined to this. He shall do a great work for you, my disciples. Thus far I have given you many teachings, but after all much remains unsaid. I have yet many things to teach you which, since you are not able to hear them now, must be reserved for the Spirit whose whole work is to reveal the truth. When he comes, he will guide you into all the truth necessary to salvation—the truth concerning my person, word, and work. Just as I have given you only what the Father has taught me, so he will not speak as an independent authority, but he will utter only what comes to him as a revelation from the Father or me and he will declare to you "the things that are coming," that is, "that future which even now is prepared and in the very process of fulfilment." He will glorify me in that he will take of mine and declare it to you. It will ever be of me as the exponent of spiritual truth, as the Saviour of the world, as the Life of men, that he will speak. Indeed, he will draw from the unlimited treasure of spiritual truth which is in God himself, since all that is mine and he will use it because it is mine. I have said that he, the Spirit of truth, in being your guide into all the truth, takes of mine and will declare it unto you. (In all this we have the full guarantee of the inspiration of the Apostles.)

The origin and reach of the Spirit's revelation (13–15)

V

THE JOY OF THE DISCIPLES ON THE RESURRECTION MORNING (16:16–24)

I. It shall come after a brief interval of deepest sorrow (20).
   (*a*) Like a mother's joy over her new-born child.
   (*b*) Because they shall see him again (16, 22b).
II. It shall be theirs forever.
III. It shall be made complete, since the Father would give them whatever they asked for their mission.

Verse 16 is to be connected with verses 5 and 6. The section gives a new reason for comfort which is connected in thought with the last reason, the coming of the Spirit, only in so far as the coming of Jesus in resurrection is the beginning of that higher manifestation which is carried on by the Spirit. It is not necessary to dismiss the thought of the resurrection as is done by giving to the second event of verse 16 a purely spiritual force; nor, on the other hand, is it necessary to confine the promise of the whole passage to this one event. As Bernhard

says, "All turns on the resurrection; and without the experiences of that time there would have been no beholding Christ in the Spirit."

The promise of the resurrection return; the perplexity of the disciples (16–18)

In a short time I shall be gone from your sight. You shall not behold me as you do now, in the familiar intercourse of daily fellowship. Then again after a short time you shall see me. Jesus was referring to his resurrection, which, from its entire method of manifestation, would be the prelude of that spiritual revelation of himself to be given through the Spirit. The disciples, however, were puzzled by this expression, "a little time." They knew that he was soon to be taken from them, but what could he mean that in "a little time" he would come again? Especially when he had said that he was going home to the Father. It was simply impossible for them to understand this strange succession of presence and absence and presence again. Jesus noting their embarrassment and their desire to question him said to them: Are you inquiring among yourselves about the meaning of my statement that "in a little while you shall not behold me, and again in a little while you shall see me"? Instead of answering this by speaking of the crucifixion and the resurrection he tells them of the opposite feeling with which as the result of each great event their hearts would be stirred. He began with the issue of that first "little while" when the cross seemed to have ended all their fond hopes. Verily,

How Jesus explains the matter to them (19, 20)

verily, I say to you, that you will soon, in the deepest grief, weep and lament. While you are in the midst of your sorrow the world with all its elements—the unthinking and unbelieving people, the proud and self-sufficient Pharisees, and the haughty and self-seeking Sadducees—will rejoice.

The joy that his resurrection will bring (20–22)

They will all think that they have triumphed in their contest with me. But there is another "little while" and at the close of that your grief shall be turned into joy. Your experience shall be much like that of a woman whose hour of travail is come. At first she can think of nothing but the anguish of her travail, but when her child is born the pain and suffering are all forgotten in the joy that a man is born into the world. This is now for you the time when the results are hidden and the pain is felt, but I shall see you again and your hearts shall rejoice, and your joy, which shall come from knowing that I have forever conquered death and have, therefore, entered upon an indissoluble fellowship with you, cannot be taken from you. In that day of your joy,—in that long and blessed dispensation beginning with the resurrection,—the mysteries which now perplex you will be illuminated.

Then they will ask the Father in his name (23, 24)

You will not then ask me questions, such as have now troubled you. "How can we know the way?" "Whither goest thou?" "What is this 'little while'?" You will go directly to the Father and I assure you that whatsoever you ask he, instead of me, will give it to you as I have, up to this time, given you what you needed. Up to this time you

have asked nothing "in my name," because I have been with you and have obtained for you all you required. Pray now habitually in my name and answers shall come making your joy complete.

VI

A SUMMARY AND A CONCLUSION (16:25–33)

The Summary:

I. Christ's present and future relations to his disciples (25–27).

II. The character of his mission (28).

The attitude of the disciples in view of these declarations (29, 30).

The Conclusion:

I. The pathetic prophecy of their desertion of him.

II. An assurance of peace, and tribulation; and through him of victory.

The time was coming when he would speak plainly to them (25)

All along, said Jesus, I have spoken to you in figurative language. This was inevitable because his history on earth was not yet complete, his human limitations were yet upon him, and above all his hearers were not yet able to understand fully a plain and purely spiritual revelation. The time was soon to be, he told them, when he would no longer speak in figures but, without reserve and in the fulness of spiritual illumination, would tell them of the Father. In

that day, said he, you will pray to the Father in my name, with a full understanding of its meaning. You will have such free and confident access to him that the answers to your prayers will come not because of my intercession in your behalf (I do not need to speak of that in this connection), but because of the Father's love for you, a love called forth and strengthened by your love for me and your faith that I came forth from him. In one brief sentence Jesus now summarizes his whole historic work: I came forth from the Father and am come into the world; again I leave the world and go to the Father. Here are set forth self-abnegation, incarnation, death and ascension. "The Apostles understand why he goes away: because he came; and whither he goes: to God, because it was from God that he came." The verse has its parallel in Paul's statement, "being in the form of God he counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself by taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him" (Phil. 2:6–9).

They would have free access to the Father, and he will answer their prayers (26, 27)

A summary of his work (28)

Joyfully surprised at Jesus's simple statement of the whole range of his being and mission the disciples exclaimed, "Behold, *now* he is speaking plainly, without figure, we do not need to wait for the future" (see 25). He had so fully anticipated their thoughts and desires in the answers which he made to them that they felt that he knew their

The disciples already feel that he has spoken plainly (29, 30)

hearts altogether and also when and how to give them all needful illumination, and so they said, "Now we know that thou knowest all things and that thou hast no need that any one should put to thee these inquiries. In this fact we find a reason for believing that thy whole ministry and message is a revelation to us of God—a coming forth to us from him." This enthusiastic confession of faith expressed probably more than the disciples meant. It seemed genuine, and in the attitude of mind which it revealed was genuine. It needed, however, all the experiences of the resurrection and Pentecost to make it firm and adequate: Jesus meets it now with a thankful recognition and a sobering prophecy. "You now believe. Deeply am I thankful for that, but a terrible trial awaits your faith. The hour is near at hand, indeed, is come, when you will be scattered each to his own house and I shall be left alone. Alone, did I say? Nay, not alone, for the Father is always with me."

A genuine confession, but needing firmness (31)

Jesus's prophecy of the trial that awaits them (32)

And now my words are finished. I have spoken them that, in all the life which you live in communion with me, you may have peace—a constant stay for your hearts amid the tribulation of the world. In the world you will have tribulation through the antagonism of men and trials of suffering, but be of good courage. I have overcome the world. Its temptations and hostilities have not once gained the upper hand over me. In my strength you, too, shall overcome and in all the struggle have my peace. Be of good courage.

They are to keep courage in the trials to come upon them (33)

VII

THE PRAYER OF JESUS (17)

1. *Introductory*

It was Luther's judgment that nowhere else in Scripture, nor, indeed, in the literature of any people, is there anything that can be compared with this prayer in simplicity, depth, grandeur, and devoutness. The more fully we understand the life of Jesus and his spirit, the more shall we comprehend the far-reaching petitions which he here offers. It seems well-nigh out of place to call attention to critical objections made against the transmission of the prayer to us as, for example, the use of "Jesus Christ" in verse 3 and the full doctrine of pre-existence (5, 22, 24). The estimate of Weiss is perhaps not exaggerated when he says that "Johannine phraseology and views are more deeply imprinted upon this prayer than upon any other passage," or of Sanday that "there is probably a prophetic element in it which is derived from the consciousness of the Apostle." Notwithstanding this, it embodies such vivid reminiscences of what Jesus said that only radical criticism can suppose it to be a free composition by the evangelist. Wendt assigns it all to the original source of the Gospel. Again let the statement have emphasis that it is true to truth.

The prayer falls into three parts:

I. For himself—glorify me (1–5).
   (*a*) The grounds of the petition.
      (1) His hour had come.
      (2) His work was finished.
      (3) He had received power over all flesh to give eternal life (2); what eternal life is (3).
   (*b*) The measure of the petition—with the glory which I had with thee (5).
   (*c*) The purpose of the petition—in order that the Son may glorify the Father (1).

II. For his immediate disciples (6–20)—Keep them in thy name (11).
   (*a*) The grounds of this petition.
      (1) They know that all things which thou hast given me are from thee (7).
      (2) They have received the words which I have given them (8).
      (3) They have believed that thou hast sent me (8).
   (*b*) The twofold content of this petition.
      (1) Sanctify them by the truth (17).
      (2) Keep them from the evil one (15).

III. For those who through the disciples' word should believe on him (21–24).

(*a*) That they may be one as we are (21).
The twofold purpose of this:
(1) That the world may believe that thou hast sent me (23).
(2) That the world may know that thou hast loved them (23).
(*b*) That they may be with thee where I am (24). The purpose of this: that they may behold my glory.

To these petitions is added almost in the form of a summary:

(1) A justification for the whole prayer (25) and
(2) An inclusive statement of the twofold purpose of it all (26).

The above analysis aims to bring out only the salient points. The interrelation of subordinate thoughts will appear in the interpretation which follows.

2. *A Prayer for Himself: Glorify Me* (17:1–5)

Hardly had the words of comfort and encouragement passed from his lips, when Jesus lifting his eyes to heaven engaged in prayer. About him stood the sad yet hopeful group of disciples listening to petitions which concerned the

profoundest relations of life—divine and human. The whole prayer has in view the saving work of God and thereby his glory. Jesus begins praying for himself, therefore, only in relation to the completion of the Father's purpose of salvation. "Father, the hour of conflict with the prince of this world, of cruel death, and of solemn departure is come. Exalt now thy Son to that place and power which shall enable him to make a larger, fuller, more glorious manifestation of thyself to men. This I ask in view of that sovereignty over all humanity which thou gavest me in sending me upon this incarnate mission of giving eternal life to those whom thou hast brought to me ready to receive it." The evangelist now parenthetically tells us that "the eternal life" of which Jesus had just spoken consists in knowing the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he had sent. In other words it is that vital understanding of God, through Jesus, his truest interpreter, which comes not simply by intellectual perception, but from sympathy and moral conformity. Jesus continues: "I have glorified thee in my earthly condition by finishing the work which thou gavest me to do. In order to carry it on to completion I need larger power. Glorify me now in heaven, O Father, in fellowship with thee and with that restoration to my divine state which I had with thee before the world came into being."

Jesus prays for exaltation to heaven (1–5)

What "eternal life" is (3)

3. *Prayer for His Disciples: Keep Them in Thy Name* (17:6–19)

To the men whom thou gavest me out of the world—these my disciples—I have set forth the innermost spiritual meaning of thy name; I have shown them all what divine Fatherhood signifies. In virtue of their inward disposition toward thee they were thine before thou gavest them to me. Thou gavest them to me and they have kept thy word.

What the disciples had come to understand (6–9)

They have come to know that all the truths and revelations which thou gavest me are really from thee. They have discerned their origin in their character. This was possible, because, as a faithful messenger, I have given to them all and only that which thou gavest me. They received it upon the authority of my testimony. By that knowledge which is gained through obedience, they have come to see that I came forth from thee, and with their whole heart they have accepted the fact that thou hast sent me on a special mission. I, who have finished my work on earth, now pray for them who are to carry it on.

The grounds of Jesus's petition for his disciples (10, 11)

I am not thinking now of the world, but only of those whom thou hast given me. I plead for them because they are *thine*, even though thou hast given them to me, since all things—words, works, disciples—that are mine are thine and thine are mine. Then, too, I have been and am now glorified in their faith in me as their Messiah. The time

has come for me to leave the world; my ministry here is over, but these beloved disciples must remain in the world, exposed to its temptations and dangers. Holy Father, keep them in that sphere of holiness and love for which thy name stands and of which my person and message have been to them the full expression. Keep them thus in order that they may be one in perfect spiritual union, as we are. While I have been with them I have thus kept them by that revelation of spiritual truth which thou gavest me to declare and I have guarded them from all the hostile influences of the world. They are all safe, except one, who by his very self-will seems doomed to destruction, in accord with the word of Scripture (Ps. 41: 9). I am about to depart and come to thee and I am uttering these petitions in the presence of these disciples in order that, when I am gone, they may have the joy which has been mine through all the trials and fears of life—the joy of knowing the power and surety of thy protection. I have put thy truth into their possession. That truth has separated them from the spirit and aims of the world as it separates me, and so the world hates them. I do not on that account ask thee to take them out of the world, for they have a great mission to accomplish, but I do beseech thee to keep them from the power of the evil one. Their very separation from the world, as I am separate from it, leads me to pray that thou wouldst strengthen and make complete that separation by means of the truth. Thy word is the revelation of eternal spiritual verities. Help

He has kept his disciples safe (12)

He prays that they may have his joy (13)

That they may be kept from the evil of the world (14–19)

them by an even clearer insight into these to devote themselves more and more fully to the enlightenment and salvation of men.

I pray for such consecration for them, because I have given them this mission to the world as thou didst give me a like mission. And I consecrate myself now to a sacrificial death in their behalf in order that they may be truly consecrated to God by purification from the defilement of sin.

4. *For Those Who through the Disciples' Word Should Believe on Him* (17:20–26)

The oneness of all believers (20, 21)

Such is my prayer for these beloved disciples, but my heart's desire reaches out beyond them to all believers in all times and places who shall by means of their preaching come to faith in me. May they all, O Father, be one! Let nothing imperil the unity of those who accept me as their Saviour. As thou art in me and I in thee—one in spirit and life—may they be one in us in order that by such a spiritual unity the world may be compelled to believe in the divine origin of my mission. I have given them what thou gavest me, the glory of revealing the divine in human life, of knowing and showing forth the Father's love in order that they, as we, may live in and for each other, I in them and thou in me, that in this absolute harmony of life a complete and final unity may be attained. The result will be that the world shall come to know, through evidence which

The great mission of believers (22, 23)

cannot be gainsaid, that my mission is from thee and that the Church is the Church of God—loved, as I have been, with a divine love. O Father, it is my last will that all those whom thou hast given me by graciously leading them to faith in me, may be with me where I am that they may behold my glory—the resplendent revelation of the heavenly state given to me by thee out of a love for me which has been from all eternity.

That all believers may be with him (24)

Righteous Father, it is true that the world has not known thee. It has failed to find thee through all its wisdom, but it had another way of knowing thee offered to it, for I knew thee and revealed thee. These few disciples have come to see that my mission is from thee. To them I have made known thy holiness and love, and I shall go on making these known as long as the world lasts in order that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be the guiding principle of their lives and that I may thus live in and through them. It is because of this exalted purpose and issue that I pray to thee, O righteous Father. Truly is the world excluded from glory, but my prayer for my disciples contemplates only that which thou canst own and answer in divinest fulness.

The ground and purpose of his prayer (25, 26)

THE PASSION

THE TRIUMPH OF UNBELIEF. VICTORY THROUGH DEATH. THE HIGHEST SELF-REVELATION OF JESUS.

Chapters 18, 19

THE PASSION

I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the evangelist again comes back to narrative; and all those characteristics of his method of narration which we have heretofore noticed appear in his story. There is in the first place a careful selection of events, and the purpose in this selection is, as usual, the exhibition of the "glory" of the Messiah. It is not so much the event in each case which interests him as it is the bearing of that event upon the revelation of the person of Christ. Here we are to see, as far as the arrest and trial are concerned, the complete voluntariness of the surrender of Jesus to his fate. Amid all the forces that combine to bring about his death, he stands Master. He goes willingly along the dark way to which they have brought him. Judas betrays him, and he immediately offers himself to the officers; Pilate threatens and is nonplussed before the dignified unresisting sufferer. Gethsemane with its intense struggle is not pictured in this gospel, but once and again in the account of the Passion

John gives us illustrations of the calm majesty, the serene peace which came to the heart of Jesus as answer to his prayer, "Let this cup pass from me."

We are also reminded now and then, that all the dark and dreadful scenes are part of the plan of God. The hatred and cruelty of men are compelled to serve him. Again it is of interest to note that there is abundant evidence of an eye-witness (see 1, 3, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, the whole account of the denials of Peter, and verse 28). An eminent jurist has said of the transactions before Pilate, that the writer of the Fourth Gospel has given us a remarkably faithful picture of its ongoing, faithful both in the clearness and naturalness of its changing situations. These two chapters (18, 19) therefore afford an excellent opportunity for the examination of the historicity of the evangelist, as well as of the way he seeks to interpret the inner meaning of the history.

II

THE ARREST (18:1–12)

Jesus goes to Gethsemane (1)

When the prayer was ended Jesus left the upper room with his disciples, and going out of the city on the eastern side, descended the hill and crossed the dry bed of the Kedron to a quiet, familiar spot owned by a friend and on the lower slope of the Mount of Olives—the Garden of

Gethsemane. In the deep, protecting shadows of its olive trees took place the agony portrayed by the Synoptics. John passes this by and introduces us to the scene at the moment when the stillness of the night was broken by the coming of a detachment of Roman soldiers accompanying the officials of the sanhedrin and some of the high-priests. All about on the hills around the city multitudes of pilgrims to the feast were camping, and it was from fear of a popular outbreak in connection with the arrest that the soldiers were called in. Judas was the guide, and he knew the spot where Jesus and the disciples had often assembled. It may have been that during the week just gone they had more than once spent the night in this very place (Lk. 21: 37). Though the full light of the Passover moon made the night brilliant, yet the officials, to guard against Jesus's concealment of himself in the deep shadows or a possible substitution of a disciple for himself, came with lanterns and torches. Jesus, knowing well what was meant by the approach of this armed company, went forth out of the shadows of the garden to meet them. Just as he stepped forth Judas probably stepped up and kissed him (Mk. 14: 45). John, in his desire to emphasize the voluntary nature of Jesus's action, passed by this incident of the kiss and gives us only the words of the Master as he turned from the treacherous act of Judas to the company. "Whom are you seeking?" he asked. "Jesus, the Nazarene," was their reply. "I am he," said Jesus. Surprised at this unexpected meeting, and super-

The officials and soldiers seek Jesus; Judas guides them (2, 3)

Jesus meets them and Judas kisses him (4, 5)

stitiously fearing that his ready appearance meant some form of judgment upon them, they hastily fell back in confusion, Judas among them. To call them to their senses and to their business, Jesus again asked whom they were seeking, and again they replied, "Jesus, the Nazarene." "I am he," said Jesus, "and inasmuch as you are seeking only me, I ask you to let these, my disciples, depart." In this request John sees an exemplification of the fulfilment of the word uttered by Jesus in his prayer (17: 12). Had they been captured apostasy might have followed. This protective intervention does not, of course, exhaust the meaning of that word, "I have kept them whom thou hast given me."

The soldiers startled, Jesus asks that his disciples may go free (6–9)

Simon Peter, thinking a rescue possible for Jesus also, impetuously drew his sword, and attacking the high-priest's servant who was probably foremost in attempting to seize Jesus, cut off his right ear. John's acquaintance with the high-priest's household enabled him to identify this servant as one named Malchus. Peter's act was rash and perilous, and if we had not the account of the miraculous cure given us by Luke (22: 51) it would be difficult to see why the hasty Apostle was not arrested. The extended rebuke of Jesus (given us in Matthew) is here condensed into the command to Peter to put his sword back into its sheath, and is followed by the question which brings out the reason for this narrative about the wounded servant, namely, the voluntariness of Jesus in meeting death. Shall I not accept

Peter's attack (10, 11)

Why this incident is given

the destiny (suffering and death) appointed me by my Father?

At the command of the chiliarch (colonel), the soldiers assisted the officers of the Sanhedrin, and they bound the hands of Jesus behind his back, preparatory to taking him away. Jesus arrested (12)

III

THE EXAMINATION BEFORE ANNAS (18:13–27)

John gives the account of the examination before Annas; the Synoptics, that before Caiaphas. The difficulties of harmonization come in connection with the denials of Peter. Did they take place during the examination before Annas, or during the succeeding examination before Caiaphas? If the designation "high-priest" in 15, 16, 19, 22 refers to Caiaphas then the verb in 24 is to be translated "had sent," and this verse (24) is inserted either between verses 13 and 14 or between 18 and 19, and that which follows in each case is the examination before Caiaphas. If the term "high-priest" signifies Annas, and this is possible (see Lk. 3:2; Acts 4:6), then the verb of verse 24 is translated "sent," and the examination before Caiaphas is not given by John. This latter interpretation supposes that Caiaphas was present during the examination before Annas; that Annas sent Jesus after he was through with him to be offi-

cially examined by Caiaphas, and that the Synoptics, knowing nothing of the preliminary examination before Annas, during which the denials actually occurred, connect these denials with the examination before Caiaphas. Identity of scene, if not of time, is gained by supposing that Annas had apartments in the palace of the high-priest Caiaphas—a natural supposition in view of the relationship of Annas and Caiaphas. This supposition is also supported by the statement in verse 28.[1]

Annas (13, 14)

Leaving the Garden of Gethsemane, the Jewish officials took Jesus first to Annas. This man who had been himself high-priest for several years (A.D. 7–14) and who still was known by this title (Acts 4: 6), exercised a commanding influence in Jerusalem, as is shown by the fact that five of his sons held the office of high-priest. He was the father-in-law of Caiaphas, the high-priest at this time, and his astuteness was sought in order to frame, if possible, from the replies of the prisoner, some specific charges to be laid later before the council. Indeed, he was to prepare the way for carrying out the policy which Caiaphas had once urged upon the authorities, namely, that it was better for one man to die for the good of the people.

Peter's trial (15, 16)

While the examination was progressing in the palace

[1] Among others the following arrangements of this chapter have been suggested in order to meet its difficulties: (1) 13–14, 19–24, 15–18, 25b–28. (2) 13, 24, 14–15, 19–23, 16–18, 25b, 28.

another inquiry was going on in the court-yard, of a different kind and issue. Peter and another disciple (presumably John) had followed Jesus to the palace gate. This second disciple, probably on account of business relations or, perhaps, because of some family connection, was known to the household of the high-priest, and was thus admitted to the palace court. Peter, as a stranger, was excluded, and stood without by the gate. John, missing him, spoke to the gate-keeper, and was allowed to bring him in. As Peter came in with John, the young girl who was attending the door asked, "You are not, too, one of that man's disciples, are you?" "No, I am not," said Peter. And with this he passed on into the court, to the place where the servants and officials were warming themselves by a charcoal fire.

First denial (17, 18)

Meanwhile, the high-priest questioned Jesus as to the number and character of his disciples, and as to the principles which he was teaching them. As the object of this was to get from his lips some utterance which they might use against him, Jesus referred them to what he had spoken openly in public. "I have taught always either in synagogue or in the Temple where all the Jews are accustomed to assemble. Never have I said one word in secret which was not to be proclaimed to all men. Why do you question *me*? Ask those who have heard me speak. Some of these very men here present know what I have said." Thinking that this reply savored of discourtesy to the high-priest, one of the officers standing by gave Jesus a blow on the cheek, saying,

The high-priest questions Jesus (19)

The reply of Jesus (20, 21)

An officer strikes Jesus on the cheek

"Is that the way you talk to the high-priest?" To this insult Jesus calmly replied, "If I have taught that which is evil, come forward as a witness of the evil which you have heard. If, on the contrary, I have taught that which is good, why do you strike me?" As nothing came of this preliminary hearing, Annas sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas, the high-priest, to undergo an official examination.

Peter's second denial (25)

To return for a moment to Peter, whom we left by the fire in the court. While he was trying to warm himself, some of the bystanders asked him if he was not one of that man's disciples. To this he made prompt denial, saying that he was not his disciple; whereupon one of the servants of the high-priest, a kinsman of him whose ear Peter cut off, asked if he had not seen him (Peter) in the Garden of Gethsemane with Jesus. Again Peter said, "No," and forthwith a cock crew. The dawn was approaching, and the warning to Peter in the upper room was fulfilled (13:38).

His third denial (26, 27)

IV

JESUS BEFORE PILATE (18:28–19:16)

The aims in John's narrative

John simply alludes to the hearing before Caiaphas; he gives us no account of it. Nor is anything told us of the "assembly of the elders" referred to in Luke. We are taken immediately from the proceedings before Annas to the palace of Pilate. His aim is to show us how un-

belief completed its course by handing Jesus over to a Gentile to be condemned to death and yet how Jesus voluntarily and in accord with the will of God met his fate. The conduct of Pilate affords a fine psychological study of the battle in a man's soul between conscience and the fear of public opnion, perhaps between conscience and selfishness as threatened by public opinion. Pilate is true to the picture which Josephus gives us of him; indeed, without John's account, we should be at a loss to explain some of the situations given us in the Synoptics. There is in this whole account remarkable fidelity to the historical situation in Judea, as we know it from other sources. John was probably present at these private examinations, for there are repeated evidences of an eye-witness.

The Jews take Jesus to the Prætorium (28a)

In the proceedings subsequent to the hearing before Annas, Jesus was condemned to death. It was necessary, now, to take him to the Roman governor to get the sentence executed. Hence, the Jews led him from the palace of Caiaphas to the royal residence of Pilate, the Prætorium. It is not certain whether by this is meant a palace on the western hill of the city, usually occupied by the governors while in the capital, or the fortress of Antonia on the north side of the Temple enclosure.

The morning was just breaking when they came, but they were very careful not to go with their prisoner into the

The Jews refuse to go into the palace (28c)

palace lest, by being defiled from entering the unpurified house of a Gentile, they could not eat the Passover. Pilate, therefore, went out to them and, in order to give formality to their charge, asked them what accusation they had to bring against their prisoner. They replied virtually: "We have decided this man's case; we are not bound to go through the evidence again for you. If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him into your hands."

They demand from Pilate the death of Jesus (29–32)

"Very well, then," said Pilate, "if you have no formal charge to make, it must be some case which you can dispose of according to your own rules. Take the man and judge him yourselves." "It is not lawful for us," replied the Jews, "to put a man to death, and we want this man put to death." In this action of the Jews, the evangelist sees the fulfilment of the prophecy of Jesus (12:32, 33): "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." The Jews were anxious to make it appear that Jesus had been condemned by the Romans. If the Romans condemned him to death, then the method of execution would be crucifixion. Thus the "lifting up" was to be fulfilled.

Pilate undoubtedly insisted upon a definite charge and the Jews now framed it, but in such a way as to make the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah the equivalent of political treason, and so punishable with death. "We found this man perverting our nation and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, and saying that he himself is Christ, a king" (Lk.

23: 2). Jesus, having entered the Prætorium, did not hear this charge, but was soon questioned about it as Pilate came within and undertook personally to examine him. "Is it true," he asked, "that thou art the King of the Jews?" "That depends upon the point of view of your inquiry," replied Jesus. "Are you asking it seriously, with a real desire to know something about the Kingdom of God, or are you simply repeating a political insinuation of my accusers?" Pilate in haughty scorn exclaimed: "Am I a Jew? What personal interest can I have in such vagaries? Your people gave you into my hands, and I am simply questioning you in reference to the charge they make against you. What have you done?" "You speak of my being delivered into your hands," replied Jesus. That ought to be sufficient evidence to you that I am not trying to set up an earthly political kingdom. Had I been aiming at this, my adherents would have fought to keep me out of the hands of the Jews. Nothing of the kind has happened and the reason is that my kingdom is not of a worldly nature, nor is it to be established by worldly means. It does not derive its origin from human will and earthly force. "So then, thou art a king?" responded Pilate. "Yes," said Jesus, "I am a king, and let me tell you what my royal mission is. For just one purpose was I born, and for the same purpose am I come into the world, namely, to bear witness to the truth to absolute reality regarding God and his relations to men. Every one who desires reality in things spiritual recognizes

Pilate questions Jesus (33–35)

Jesus repudiates the charge (36)

Jesus acknowledges that he is king (37, 38a)

and obeys my divine authority." "Absurd! What is truth?" exclaimed Pilate.

Pilate finds no fault in him (38b)

Convinced that the man before him was no seditionist, Pilate went out of the Prætorium to the Jews and said to them: "For my part, I find in this man no just ground for your accusation. He may be an innocent enthusiast; he certainly is no instigator of rebellion. Let me suggest to you that, following the custom according to which the procurator frees one prisoner at the time of the Passover, I set free this King of the Jews. Do you agree to this?" "No! No! We do not," they shouted (they had shouted in this way before). "Don't you let him go! Release Barabbas!" The evangelist, to show the insincerity of the Jews, adds, "Now this Barabbas was a robber." They had concocted the charge of sedition against Jesus and wished him to be put to death for it; in almost the same breath they were calling for the release of an actual leader of sedition.

He suggests letting him go. They call for Barabbas (39, 40)

Pilate's second compromise (19: 1)

Failing by this compromise to save his prisoner, Pilate now resorted to another. It was the custom among the Romans to scourge the victim condemned to crucifixion. This was done by binding him in a stooping posture to a low column and then striking his bared back with a whip, the thongs of which were weighted with lead and studded with sharp-pointed pieces of bone. The laceration and suffering were terrible, and often victims died under its cruel ongoing. Pilate hoped to satisfy the hungry passion of the Jews by this amount of agony and then let his pris-

oner go. In their contempt for the Jews, it occurred to the soldiers that it would be fine sport for them to show their ridicule of the well-known Messianic hope of the nation. Accordingly, they plaited a crown of thorns which they forced down upon his head, and they put upon him one of the ordinary red mantles of a soldier. Then they kept coming up to him and derisively saying, "Hail, King of the Jews," at the same moment slapping him in the face. All this happened within the Prætorium. Pilate now goes out again to the people and once more asserts that he can find no just reason for condemnation. In order to make an effective appeal, he has Jesus brought out, still clothed in the mocking garb of royalty, and showing all the signs of suffering. "Behold the fellow!" he said to them. "Has he not suffered enough? Shall I not let him go?" Instead of moving the onlookers to pity, the sight rather stirred them to deeper hatred, and they took up the cry to which the chief priests and their officials incited them, "To the cross with him! Crucify him!" "If he is to be crucified," answered Pilate, "then you must do it. I can find in him no reason for it." The Jews now abandoned the political charge and brought forth the real reason of their hatred. "He may have committed no crime," they said, "judged by Roman law, but *we* have a law, and according to it he ought to die, because he has made himself more than Cæsar, yes, more than man, even Son of God." This charge, incomprehensible as it was, in even the Jewish sense, to the Rom-

The soldiers mock him (2, 3)

Pilate again asserts Jesus's innocence (4, 5)

The cry, "Crucify him!" (6)

They charge him with making himself the Son of God (7)

an, awakened in his superstitious, conscience-smitten mind an awesome uneasiness. There was much in the victim's words and bearing to quicken the dread which this last charge had begotten. He had been warned by his wife to take no part in condemning Jesus (Matt. 27: 19). Perhaps he was some mysterious being half-divine, half-human, such as Roman mythology was familiar with; at any rate, he would inquire further, and so he took Jesus back again into the Prætorium. "What do they mean," he asked, "by asserting that you claim to be of divine origin? Whence are you?" To this Jesus made no reply. It would have been simply impossible to make Pilate understand. Naturally, the procurator was annoyed at this silence, and he haughtily asked, "Do you refuse to answer? Are you unmindful of the fact that I have the power to release you or to crucify you?" "Whatever power you have against me," said Jesus in reply, "you have because it has been given to you from above. Human government is ordained of God. And since power has been given to thee, Caiaphas, as representing the sanhedrin, has the greater guilt; with *criminal* intent he makes use of your *lawful* power."

Pilate now superstitiously troubled, questions Jesus (8–11)

In consequence of this answer Pilate sought to release him. We do not know how, but the attempt drove the Jews to desperate efforts to accomplish their purpose. Dropping entirely the religious plea of a transgression of their holy law, they affected to be zealous in their loyalty to Cæsar, the man whom on earth they most deeply hated. If you let this

man go, they shouted in their excitement, you are not a friend of the emperor. Every man who sets himself up as king, sets himself against the emperor. Tiberius, the reigning emperor, was both suspicious and jealous. Pilate's past record had not been altogether satisfactory to Rome; the appeal to his selfish fears was successful. He formally took his place upon the judgment-seat, which was upon a raised tessellated platform, called in Hebrew Gabbatha. Both the day and the hour of this critical act are given us by the evangelist. It was on the day of preparation for the Passover, somewhere about noon. In sarcasm and anger, Pilate, pointing to Jesus, whom he had brought again out of the Prætorium, said, "See, here is your noble king!" The words were the signal for an outburst of rage. "Away with him! Away with him! Crucify him!" "What! Shall I crucify your king?" With a lie born of their hatred, the chief priests answered, "We have no king but Cæsar." There was now no longer any room for delay. Pilate handed over his prisoner to the sanhedrists with the authority to crucify him.

The Jews appeal to Pilate's fears (12)

Pilate succumbs (13–16)

V

THE CRUCIFIXION AND DEATH (19:17–30)

It is difficult to appreciate fully the horrors of the Roman method of execution until one has acquainted himself with the brutality, torture, and shame attending

The horror of the Roman way of crucifixion

it. Fever, slow death, and insanity were its usual accompaniments. Jesus, dying literally of a "broken heart," was spared the long agony which otherwise might have come to him. Concerning the site of Calvary, a considerable literature has in recent years come into existence. Every Protestant traveller to Jerusalem must certainly wish that the hill above Jeremiah's grotto, not far from the present Damascus gate, may ultimately prove to be the true site. John's account of the crucifixion, as compared with the Synoptics, is condensed. What is narrated tends toward the glorification of the Messiah, in that Scripture is being fulfilled. There are details given which reveal an eye-witness.

The site of Calvary

The Jewish authorities received Jesus from the hands of Pilate and proceeded at once to crucifixion. It was the custom both among the Romans and the Jews to execute criminals outside of the city, and so the crowd, with the prisoner bearing his own cross, found its way to a place called, from its peculiar shape, the skull, in Hebrew, Golgotha. Here they fastened the body of Jesus to a prostrate cross with nails and ropes, and then raised the cross and thrust it into the socket prepared for it. At the same time two others, "robbers," Matthew calls them, were crucified, one on each side of the cross of Jesus, and the awful agony began. Usually a board whitened with gypsum and containing a statement of his crime was carried either by

They take Jesus to Golgotha (17, 18)

the criminal himself, or before him on the way to execution. This board was afterward nailed to the cross. Pilate saw in this custom an opportunity to humble the pride of the Jews, and so he had prepared for the cross of Jesus the following superscription: "Jesus the Nazarene, King of the Jews." That everybody might be able to read the insult, he had it written in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek. The place of crucifixion was so near to the city that many of the Jews could from the house-tops read the inscription. Naturally, they were indignant, and the chief priests, here significantly noted as "the chief priests of the Jews" (in contrast perhaps to their King of the Jews), tried to persuade Pilate to change the inscription so as to make it read that he said "I am King of the Jews." This would show that the claim was not admitted. Pilate gladly and persistently refused to do it. "What I have written, I have written," he replied, "let it stand!"

Pilate's inscription (19)

The Jews try to have Pilate change it (20–22)

VI

THE FOUR ENEMIES AND THE FIVE FRIENDS (19:23–27)

A squad of four soldiers had been detailed to carry out the execution. To them, by custom, belonged the clothes of the crucified, and they proceeded to appropriate them by dividing them into four portions, one to each soldier. When

The soldiers cast lots for his garment (23, 24)

they came to the close-fitting inner tunic, or vest, they were for a moment at a standstill. This garment, like the tunic of the high-priest, was seamless and woven in one piece from top to bottom. It could not be divided without being ruined. They concluded, therefore, to cast lots for it. In this scene was realized to the very letter the description given by the psalmist when he draws the picture of Israel's king in the height of his sufferings. "They parted my raiment among them, and for my vesture they did cast lots" (Ps. 22: 18). In these words the evangelist hears the Messiah speaking, and it is significant also for him that this customary act of the soldiers, without intention on their part, indicated Jesus to be the true David. The cross by its inscription, and the soldiers by their unconscious fulfilment of prophecy, glorified him who suffered.

In striking contrast to this group of soldiers near the cross, is another made up of four ministering women and the beloved disciple. These faithful followers had kept as near to their Lord as they could. They were Mary, the mother of Jesus, her sister, Salome, the mother of John, Mary, the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. As Jesus looked down upon his mother, supported in her anguish by the disciple whom he loved, he said to her, "Woman [a term of respect], behold thy son. I am going away; he will take my place, and care for you in true sympathy." Then turning his eyes to John, he said, "Behold thy mother. Let her be as a mother for whom you will

The friends at the cross (25)

Jesus commits his mother to John (26, 27)

care and provide." Gladly did the beloved disciple accept this commission from the lips of his dying Master, and from that hour he took Mary to his own home.

In accord with his desire to present those incidents which were a fulfilment of prophecy, John calls attention now to that moment when, nearing the end of his sufferings and experiencing the torture of a burning thirst, Jesus exclaimed, "I am thirsty" (see Ps. 69: 21). It is to be noted that the evangelist uses here the word "completed," instead of "fulfilled," meaning thereby that this utterance of physical suffering was the last thing required to make complete that prophetic picture of the suffering Messiah, the details of which have been given us in the progress of the awful night and day of the Lord's passion. Near the cross stood a vessel of sour wine, the drink of common workmen and soldiers, provided here for the sufferers, as is evident from the means at hand to give it to them, namely, a sponge fastened upon a stalk of hyssop. The drink was given to him by a pitying soldier, who, perhaps, as Weiss says, explained his action to the bystanders (who were in scorn refusing it in order to see whether Elijah would help him out —see Mk. 15: 36) by saying that he wished to preserve the life of the dying man long enough to see whether Elias would come to save him. When Jesus had taken it he cried out, "It is finished," and bowing his head gave up his spirit. All had been done that could be done to reveal to men the true character of God and his purpose to save

Prophecy completed (28, 29)

The cry, "It is finished" (30)

them. Voluntarily, gladly Jesus gave up his life to make that revelation complete.

Means used to hasten death

It was the Roman custom to leave the corpses of the crucified to putrefy on the cross or to be consumed by birds of prey and wild beasts. To hasten death, as well as to prevent rescue in case living victims were left unguarded, it was also customary to break their legs by a bar or heavy mallet. The afternoon of the day of preparation was well along, and the coming day beginning at six o'clock in the evening was to be a "great" day, being the Passover as well as the ordinary Sabbath. The precaution, therefore, that the land should not be polluted by a dead body unburied before sunset (Deut. 21: 23) was very urgent. The Jews accordingly begged Pilate to order the legs of the sufferers to be broken that death might be hastened and the bodies taken away. Pilate, respecting the scruples of the Jews, sent orders to have this done. The soldiers began with the "robbers," but when they came to Jesus they found the command unnecessary, for he was already dead. In order, however, to be sure that life was extinct, one of the soldiers gashed his side with a spear, and from the cut came out blood and water. If Jesus died of a broken heart, as several details regarding his death seem to indicate, this mixed flow of blood and water came from the pericardium, which, being filled with blood by the heart's rupture, allowed the rapid separation of the solid and liquid elements. The evangelist of course knows nothing of the physiological process,

Pilate sent orders to have the legs broken (31, 32)

Jesus being dead, the legs were not broken (33, 34)

but records the fact. It is a fact proving death, rather than one suggesting allegorical interpretations.

Jesus actually died

To this fact of the death of Jesus the evangelist bears emphatic witness. What he bears witness to, he saw with his own eyes. It is therefore adequate testimony; also its contents are true. The death was no swoon; it was an actual cessation of physical life. And what is shown by this death, which needed no breaking of the legs to bring it about, and which was confirmed by the result of the spear? This, that Jesus was the Messiah, for in both of these incidents the Scripture was fulfilled which says, "a bone of him shall not be broken" (Ex. 12: 46), and "They shall look on him whom they pierced." "The first fact (to quote Westcott) pointed the student of Scripture to the fulfilment in Jesus of the symbolism of the law; the second to the fulfilment in him of the promises as the representative of Jehovah."

The fulfilment of Scripture (36)

VII

THE BURIAL (19:38–42)

At the very moment when unbelief seemed triumphant, faith was exhibited in the persons of two members of the Jewish aristocracy, Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus. All had happened as Jesus had predicted. John makes that clear. This supreme hour which at the time seemed the very extinguishing of the hopes of the

disciples was to the Apostle, when he wrote, supreme in quite another sense. He had made us see not only the intense perversity of the Jews and the faith of a few trustful souls, but also the total, sublime self-surrender of him who "died to save us all."

Had the ordinary course with reference to the bodies of crucified criminals now been followed, they would have been cast into some common pit of refuse. Such probably was the fate of the robbers, but the body of Jesus was saved from this dishonor. A disciple, keeping his discipleship hitherto secret because of his fear of the Jews, was now emboldened, through his very fear of the threatening disgrace to the body of his Lord, to go to Pilate and ask that he might take the body away. This was Joseph of Arimathea (place not identified), a rich man and member of the sanhedrin who had made Jerusalem his home, as is shown by his possession of a sepulchre in the vicinity. Pilate was surprised that Jesus had died so soon (Mk. 15: 44), but having made himself sure of the fact, gave Joseph permission to take the body. Nor was Joseph the only secret disciple who at this time openly confessed his faith in the dead teacher. Another member of the sanhedrin came forward to aid him in his effort to give Jesus an honorable burial,—Nicodemus, who had once gone to Jesus by night to talk with him about the Kingdom of God. He brought about a hundred pounds of a fragrant mixture of myrrh and aloes

Joseph of Arimathea asks for the body (38)

Nicodemus assists at the burial (39–42)

to be used for embalming. Together they wrapped the body of Jesus in linen bandages smeared with the mixture, preparing it for the tomb according to the custom of the Jews, and then they laid it away in Joseph's new sepulchre, which was located in a garden not far from the spot where the crucifixion had taken place. The day—this eventful Friday—was very near its close, and what preparation could be made had to be hurried. So, too, it was necessary to use a sepulchre close at hand, as Joseph's was, for a provisional, if not permanent, resting place.

THE RESURRECTION

THE BEGINNING OF EXALTATION. THE MESSIAH GLORIFIED. FAITH TRIUMPHANT.

Chapter 20

THE RESURRECTION

I

Introductory

To any careful reader of the two preceding chapters it must be apparent how naturally and yet emphatically incidental details set forth the actual death of Jesus upon the cross. The experience of the soldier who went to break the victims' legs, the demand of Pilate for a confirmation of the report of death, the interference of friends to save the body from disgraceful burial—all these details have the stamp of facts. The hour of their happening was to all the disciples dark and desperate. They had lost their Master. Suddenly on that first Easter morning it was discovered that the grave had lost its occupant, and to one after another of the disciples Jesus appeared. The situation, except for one who had actually lived through it, was not easy to portray. It demanded more than the setting forth of the fact of the resurrection itself. It ought and must give some insight into the mental attitude of the disciples and keep for us a consistent presentation of the risen Lord. Notwithstanding their variations in matters of detail, all the

Gospels are not wanting in the above respects. Particularly is this chapter in John noteworthy for its psychological truthfulness. The account of the experiences of the disciples after the resurrection is not complete; it is not meant to be, but in its few scenes we have much evidence of fidelity to history. Note, for example, the distinct individuality of the apostles—Peter, John, Thomas, Mary Magdalene; the excited questioning and wondering in view of the stupendous fact for which they seem to have been wholly unprepared, since "as yet they knew not the Scripture that he must rise again from the dead"; and at last the joyous, unshakable conviction when the fact becomes clear. Another's words are not too strong when he says that—"we have had before narratives remarkable for beauty and for life-like minuteness of detail, but here they reach their climax." True to the character of the Gospel, this chapter aims to convey to us through outward facts a revelation of spiritual truth.

II

PETER AND JOHN AT THE EMPTY SEPULCHRE—JOHN'S FAITH (20:1–10)

The shadows of night had hardly given place to the gray light of the dawn of our Sunday (the first day of the week) when Mary Magdalene with some other women set out for

the sepulchre to complete the work of embalming left unfinished by reason of the brief time remaining on Friday. They expected to find the stone before the sepulchre and would seek help to remove it in order to accomplish their purpose. Mary, somewhat in advance of the others, discovered to her utter astonishment, as she came near to the spot, that the entrance to the tomb was open. She concluded at once that the body of the Lord had been taken away, and in her perplexity and anxiety turned right back to go and tell Peter and the beloved disciple. Passing the women she told them what she had seen, and they hurried on to the city. Her word to the surprised and troubled disciples was, "They have taken the Lord away from the sepulchre and we [the other women and I] do not know what other burying-place they have chosen." Wondering what this meant, the disciples started immediately for the tomb. As they came near, they both in their eagerness began to run—but John, the younger man, outran Peter and reached the sepulchre first. Held by his strong emotions, John did not enter the sepulchre but, stooping down, looked through the doorway and saw the linen bandages lying within. Peter, coming soon after, went right into the tomb and looked carefully at the bandages. He discovered the handkerchief, which had been tied under the chin to keep the mouth closed, neatly folded and laid by itself. These were evidences that the body had not been stolen, nor even that it had been taken by friends. In the former case, the

The women go to the tomb: they discover the stone rolled away (1)

Her word to the disciples (2–4)

Evidences that the body had not been taken or stolen (5–7)

wrappings would have been taken with the body; in the latter, there would have been no reason why all the care, now manifest, should have been taken. Having stood in the doorway all the while Peter was within and having discussed with him the meaning of what they saw, John now entered the empty sepulchre and the truth flashed upon him. At last he believed that Jesus had risen. The empty grave and the signs of deliberate care had made him see what Scripture had not been able to teach him, even though it had said that their Lord must rise from the dead. Peter did not at this time come to such clear faith. It is John's experience which he wishes us here to understand. Both disciples, because they could do nothing more at the sepulchre, returned home.

John's faith (8–10)

III

CHRIST'S APPEARANCE TO MARY MAGDALENE (20:11–18)

Mary had followed Peter and John back to the sepulchre, and, while they were engaged examining the interior of the tomb, she had stood without weeping in hopeless sorrow over the loss of her Lord's body. After the disciples were gone she, too, went to the doorway and peered in to convince herself that the tomb was really empty. To her wondering gaze appeared two angels in glittering garments,

Mary Magdalene sees the angels (11–13)

sitting the one at the head and the other at the foot of the space in which the body of Jesus had rested.[1] They asked her why she was weeping, and so absorbed was she in her loss that she answered them as simply as if she were talking to the disciples or to some of her friends: "Because they have taken away my Lord and I do not know where they have laid him." Just then the sound of a footstep or the sense of a presence behind her caused her to turn quickly around. Every presence would but set her upon quest of the information to which her absorbing sorrow urged her. At that early hour no one was more likely to be in the garden than the garden keeper, and seeing some one near her she supposed it was he. In the dim light, her tear-filled eyes did not recognize Jesus when he asked her why she was weeping and whom she was looking for, and so she said, "Sir, if thou and not his enemies took him away, tell me where you have placed him. I will relieve you of all inconvenience about the body by taking it away myself."

Mary's deep trouble and Christ's appearance (14, 15)

[1] Criticism has found considerable difficulty with this incident of the angels. They are nowhere else mentioned in the gospel except figuratively in 1: 52 and in the citation of rumor (12: 59). It is also to be noted that in this instance they serve no distinct purpose in the ongoing of the story. Mary pays little attention to their question. On the contrary the simplicity of the narrative is in its favor. Is the incident a presentation in the form of the supernatural of a natural occurrence such, e. g., as the mistaking of the white garments and the echo in Mary's imagination of the question of the Lord (vs. 15), or was it an actual happening? There will probably be a difference of judgment in accord with the general view of the supernatural on the part of the interpreter. Jesus himself believed in angels and there is no inherent impossibility of their manifestation at this time.

Without waiting seemingly for an answer she turned back toward the sepulchre, when Jesus called her by name. At the sound she turned quickly to search him with her gaze. Surprise, recognition, joy are all heard in her exclamation, "Rabboni!" (i. e., My Master!) as she cast herself at his feet seeking to clasp them. Once more she had her Lord and she would hold him to enjoy the fellowship which death had rudely interrupted. This could not be, and so Jesus bids her not to cling to him. The fellowship for which she longed could not come until he had ascended to the Father. Then in spiritual communion she should have a realization of his presence worth far more than that which could come in earthly form. "Go and tell my brothers," he said to her, "that I am about to ascend to my Father and to your Father, to my God and to your God; that they, in the new state into which I am about to enter, shall be one with me." Without delay Mary went and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and gave them the message which he had sent to them.

She recognizes Jesus (16)

"Do not touch me" (17)

His message to the disciples (17, 18)

IV

THE APPEARANCE TO THE DISCIPLES, THOMAS BEING ABSENT (20:19–23)

The next appearance of the risen Lord which John records was late on Sunday evening and at Jerusalem. The news of the resurrection had begun to spread abroad,

and the disciples were not certain as to what course the authorities would pursue with reference to them.

They, apostles and others, had, therefore, all gathered in an upper room and carefully locked the doors. Here they were probably talking about the wonderful events of the day, when suddenly Jesus stood in the midst and said to them, "Peace be with you." The impression which the account gives is that he entered the room miraculously, and this feature corresponds with a number of others given us by the Gospels, all going to show that after the resurrection Jesus was not subject to the ordinary limitations of space and time. Notwithstanding his salutation, they were terrified at this sudden apparition, thinking they saw a spirit. It was to quiet this alarm by convincing them of his identity that Jesus showed them his hands and his side. As they recognized the unmistakable marks of the cross and realized that their Lord was actually with them again, their fear gave place to the fullest joy. He now repeated his significant salutation to them, "Peace be unto you," and at the same time he conferred upon them the office and gift of ministry as his representatives. As the Father made me an apostle, giving to me an abiding mission, so now I am sending you forth to help me in its execution; to be my ministers. Then, by the symbolical act of breathing upon them, he imparted to them that gift of the Holy Spirit which served to make them sure of his glorified condition; to quicken their faith in view of his resurrection. In his resurrection

Jesus suddenly appears in their midst (19)

Jesus quiets them by showing his hands and side (20)

He commissions them (21)

they could thus find the surety of the forgiveness of sins for all who would come into fellowship with him; hence, forever associated with this presence of the Spirit was to be that power which he now promised the Church should have of declaring the conditions on which forgiveness is granted and the fact that it has or has not been granted.

V

THE APPEARANCE TO THE DISCIPLES, THOMAS BEING PRESENT (20:24–29)

On that evening when the above words were spoken Thomas, one of the twelve, known also as Didymus, was not with the disciples. Accordingly, when they first met him, they gave him an account of all that occurred, of the sudden apparition, of their fear, of Christ's gracious invitation to examine his hands and side, and of their joy in seeing their Lord. Thomas, naturally pessimistic, listened with incredulity. He knew that his companions were honest men, but he was afraid they had been victims of some hallucination. He must himself see with his own eyes before he could believe. Unless *I*, too, see in his hands the prints of the nail, put my finger upon those nail-prints, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe. The whole form of this condition shows that Thomas's doubt was born of the

Thomas doubts (24, 25)

Character of his doubt

reason and not of the will. He was ready to believe upon what seemed to him adequate evidence.

To such doubt Jesus was ever ready to give patient hearing and help. On the following Sunday the disciples were all together again in an upper room, Thomas being with them this time. As on the previous occasion the doors had been carefully closed, and as before Jesus suddenly stood in the midst of the little group and saluted them, "Peace be with you." Knowing all that had passed between Thomas and the apostles, and appreciating the difficulty of the doubting disciple he said to him, "Thomas, reach hither your finger and touch my hands and put your hand upon my side. Do not allow yourself to become worthless by settling down into a condition of unbelief, but become a believer." The test which Thomas himself had proposed he had no need of. The very sight of the Lord with his pierced hands and the proof of omniscience which the reading of his heart and thoughts had given him, brought back his faith with a bound and he broke forth into the confession, "My Lord and my God." With this exalted conclusion of love and reason this gospel virtually closes.

Again Jesus appears suddenly and addresses Thomas (26, 27)

Thomas joyfully believes (28)

It ends where it began, in setting forth the divine nature and character of him who is the Saviour of men. "In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was God." "My Lord and my God."

The book ends where it began

Speaking to Thomas after his confession Jesus said,

A blessing upon those who have not seen (29)

You, Thomas, have believed because your senses have had evidence of my resurrection. "Blessed are they who have not seen and yet have believed in the testimony of others," a beatitude resting upon the Church of all ages and climes.

VI

CONCLUSION AND PURPOSE OF THE GOSPEL (20:30, 31)

Nature and purposes of this gospel (30, 31)

This book is not a complete record of the sayings and doings of Jesus. It is a gospel, not a biography. It is indeed true that Jesus wrought many other signs, indications of his divine nature and mission, in the presence of his disciples, which are not recorded in this book. It contains rather a selection of events with a twofold object: (1) that the reader may believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, that is, the fulfiller both of the promises to Israel and of the destiny of mankind; and (2) that in virtue of such faith he may have divine, enduring life in fellowship with him.

THE EPILOGUE

Chapter 21

THE EPILOGUE

I

Introductory

Two questions present themselves regarding this chapter and they have been much discussed. (1) Is it really an epilogue or an appendix? (2) By whom was it written? In answering the first, opinion is far more nearly unanimous than in its answers to the second. The formal closing of the Gospel at 20:30, 31 and the general character of this section seem sufficient to establish the conclusion that we have here a chapter written after the Gospel narrative itself was finished and yet published with the Gospel for a specific purpose. It is to be noted that while the appearance of Jesus here recorded is the third to the disciples (see 20:19 and 20:26) its interest centres not in the begetting or confirmation of their faith but in the work and future of two of their number. Out of the words of Jesus about the evangelist a serious misunderstanding had arisen. The report had become current that John would not die. It is to correct this that the epilogue is written. In order to

do it the circumstances are given in which Jesus was led to speak of John's future. There are some minor points in the style of the section, a few unusual words, which have been used to prove a different authorship. They are, however, so far overbalanced by similarities to the style of the Gospels as to give them really little worth. Verses 24, 25 are undoubtedly not from the same hand as the rest of the chapter. The remaining verses show marked Johannine characteristics. There is the same minuteness of description and fidelity to place and person. There is also a like psychological truthfulness to that apparent again and again in the Gospel.

II

THE EPISODE AT THE SEA OF TIBERIAS (21:1–23)

The disciples had returned to Galilee (1–3)

After the resurrection the disciples had remained a week in Jerusalem (20 : 26). In that time they all came to a sure, glad conviction regarding the fact of their Master's reappearance. They had now returned to Galilee to wait for definite instructions. While waiting, the Lord manifested himself again to them and in the following way: Seven of the disciples (Peter, Thomas, Nathanael of Cana, James, John and two others, unknown), living in the same neighborhood, were together one day upon the shore of the Sea

of Tiberias. Whether because of some uneasiness from lengthened waiting or from some necessity, the proposal of Peter that they take up again the old business of fishing met with hearty assent. Securing a boat they embarked at nightfall and spent that entire night upon the lake in fruitless trial. In the early dawn of the morning Jesus stood upon the shore, but the disciples, not looking for him at such a time and more or less preoccupied with their duties, did not recognize him. Jesus, appearing as an intending purchaser, said, "Lads, have you taken no fish?" "No," they answered. "Cast your net on the right side," he directed, "and you will have success." Thinking that from the shore he had seen some signs of fish, they followed his directions, and their net became so full that they had not strength to draw it into the boat.

Jesus appears upon the lake shore (4–6)

It was John who first guessed the real meaning of this surprising reversal of the night's poor luck. No passing stranger up the beach had brought such good fortune to them. It was the Lord. He said this to Peter, who no sooner heard it, than he, having with instinctive reverence fastened on his fisher's coat (he was wearing only a loin-cloth), plunged into the lake to go to the shore. The other disciples followed in the boat, dragging behind the net with its fish, for the distance from shore was not more than about one hundred yards. As they disembarked they saw, with some surprise, a fire of coals upon the beach and on the fire fish and bread. These had been in

John guesses who the stranger is (7)

As they land, they see a fire of coals on the beach (9)

some way prepared by the Lord (not necessarily by miracle), and he was intending to have the disciples breakfast with him. For this reason he bade them add to his scanty supply from the catch which they had in their net. Peter went on board to get the fish and drew up the crowded net to the shore. It was found to have in it one hundred and fifty-three fish—a number that in the circumstances fixed itself upon the mind of the evangelist. A surprising fact, too, was that despite such a heavy load, the net was in no way broken. While they were counting the fish, the extra supply upon the fire became ready and Jesus invited them all to breakfast with him. In awe the disciples held back. They knew it was the Lord; reverence restrained them from asking curious questions. Jesus therefore came forward, took of the bread and fish and gave them each. The evangelist speaks of this manifestation of Jesus to the disciples as the third. He is probably counting it in connection with the two appearances of which he has given an account in 19–23, 26–29.

Jesus invites them to breakfast; in awe they held back (10–14)

Christ's conversation with Peter (15–19)

Nothing is said here of the faith of the disciples; the scene is apparently an introduction to what follows and so the narrative proceeds to relate the conversation which took place after breakfast was over. Jesus then turned to Simon Peter and said: "Simon, son of John, do you love me more than these, thy fellow-disciples, love me? The question was intended to call to mind the protestations which he had made before his sad denial, when he said, "If all shall be

offended in thee, I will never be offended" (Matt. 26: 33). "I will lay down my life for thee" (13: 37). The reply of the repentant Peter shows how his experience had humbled him; it makes no claim to superior affection. "Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. Such love as I may dare in my humility to offer thee, is, indeed, thine." "Then," said Jesus, "I entrust to your love the care of those loving me who especially need care—the lambs of my flock. Do you, as an undershepherd, see to it, that they have proper and sufficient food." Leaving now all others out of the comparison, Jesus again asked, "Are you sure that love and nothing but love is the bond between you and me?"(Bruce.) "Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee." "Be then," said Jesus, "a careful shepherd of my sheep—guiding and feeding and protecting them." Then Jesus asked him the same question a third time, there being evidently in his mind the purpose of reminding Peter of his threefold denial. Peter was grieved by the doubt implied, but he knew he had given just cause for it, and so in eager earnestness he offered his heart to the gaze of Omniscience. "Thou knowest all things, Lord, thou seest that I love thee." Again Jesus gave him the commission of shepherding his flock, and then, in solemn prophecy, let him know that the time would come when he would unfalteringly prove his love, even as once rashly he had boasted he would, by suffering and death.

"In the vigor of your present manhood," said Jesus, "you

The prophecy of Peter's martyrdom (18, 19)

are accustomed to gird yourself, as you just now did in leaving the boat, and your will has been your law, but when you shall have grown old you will helplessly lift your hands while another girds you and takes you whither you would not go." In this way Jesus pointed out to him that martyrdom by which he would at last glorify God.

Peter's question about "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (20, 21)

Having said this, Jesus withdrew from the little company and bade Peter "follow him." They had not gone far when, hearing steps behind them, Peter turned and saw John coming. The description of this disciple as the one whom Jesus loved, who had the honored place by his Master at the supper, and who, in confidence, learned the name of the betrayer, is all in order to justify his following without invitation. He felt sure that Jesus had nothing to keep secret from him. Peter and John were close friends and it was but a natural sympathetic interest which led Peter, so well aware now of his own fate, to ask what was in reserve for his friend. The question was displeasing to Jesus, and he quietly rebuked him by telling him that it was beyond his promise to seek to know the future of another disciple. If I will that he abide until I come, what is that to thee? Your single and only duty is to follow me. The import of this answer was soon misunderstood, for the report gained currency that John was not to die. The misunderstanding arose from the form of Christ's reply to Peter, which was not "that he shall not die," but "If I will that he remain until I come, what is that to thee?"

The curiosity of Peter rebuked (22)

Because of the wrong conclusion taken from these words, the death of John caused offence, since it was declared that Jesus's prediction had not been fulfilled. This appendix to the Gospel was written to correct this mistake.

III

CONCLUDING WORDS (21:24, 25)

As in the case of the Appendix, so here the authorship of these few closing words must be decided from internal evidence. This points in the case of verse 24 to the testimony of a plurality of persons, and in verse 25 to a single individual's estimate. The "we" in 24 refers to those who had lived in fellowship with the Apostle and whose authority was sufficient to give value to their witness to the trustworthiness of the Apostle's record. The supposition that they were the Ephesian Elders is not without reason. This statement is their certificate to the authorship and truthfulness of the Gospel.[1] Verse 25 is by a third hand; it may have been from one of the group referred to by the "we" of verse 24.

As this account (both Gospel and Appendix) goes forth to the world, we, who have known the Apostle personally and have found him truthful and holy in all his conduct,

[1] It really ranks as part of the external evidence for the Gospel.

wish to testify to the fact that he, in addition to bearing witness among us concerning these things, has also written them down in his book, and we know that his testimony is true.

To which general testimony let me add this, that this narrative, while it is true, is but a portion of the truth, for Jesus did many things besides those here recorded, indeed, so many that if they should in each detail be written down, I think the world could not contain the books that should be written. The depth and fulness of the life of the Son of God are practically inexhaustible.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

I

THE NARRATIVE OF THE WOMAN TAKEN IN ADULTERY

(7:53–8:11)

The general verdict of criticism is that this section was not a part of the original Gospel of John. The reasons given for this judgment are:

(1) That it has no claim to acceptance on documentary grounds.

(2) That it is not in the style of John but shows characteristics of the Synoptics.

(3) That it in no way fits into the context in which it is placed.

It is not necessary to write out here a list of the early documents in which this passage does not appear. These are given in the second volume of Westcott and Hort's Greek Text (Harper's Edition). The best uncial MSS. do not contain it nor is it found in any of the ancient versions. "In the whole range of Greek patristic literature before Centuries Ten or Twelve, there is but one trace of any knowledge of its existence, namely, the reference to it in the Apostolic Constitution, without, however, any indication of the book

from which it is quoted" (Hort). While absent from the earliest Latin texts the section appeared in Latin Gospels of the fourth century. Dr. Hort concludes that it first came into John's Gospel as an insertion into a comparatively late Western text, having originally belonged to an extraneous independent source (Greek Text, Vol. II., p. 88). It may at first have stood at the end of the Gospel and later have been transferred to its present position. The conjectural reason for this position is that it recounts an unsuccessful attack upon Jesus and illustrates the statement of 8:15. The scene has all the marks of verisimilitude and probably comes from Passion Week. Note the opening statement: "Jesus went unto the Mount of Olives and early in the morning he came again into the temple" (8:1, 2); also the temptation by which a specific change was sought. This is like the efforts made in the last days to entrap him (see Mk. 12:12–27). In addition to its irrelevancy to the context, there are also decided marks, both in vocabulary and tone, which show that, worthy as the incident is, it is not an integral part of John's Gospel. It is best therefore to present it in an appendix. The severance of the section from its proper context makes the reference of its opening words, "and they went to his house," quite obscure. It is best to leave them as they stand without attempting any specific reference.

The Scribes and Pharisees bring the guilty woman to Jesus (3, 4)

And every one went to his own home; but Jesus, as was his custom during Passion Week, went to the Mount of Olives to spend the night (Lk. 21: 37). Early in the morning he was again in the temple and all the people gathered around him. As he sat teaching them, the Scribes and Pharisees, his determined opponents, brought a woman taken in the act of adultery, and forcing her, regardless of the shame of discovery, to stand before him in the midst of the crowd, they told him that she had been caught in the very act. Judging from the form of punishment referred to, the culprit must have been a betrothed bride, since only such were condemned by the law of Moses to be stoned to death (Deut. 22: 23). In this severe condemnation of the law lay the means for "tempting" him. "What is your judgment in the case?" they asked, feeling pretty sure that, in accordance with the compassionate attitude which he had often shown toward sinners, he would in some way show mercy and thus be open to the charge of denying the supremacy of the law. To their question Jesus made no reply; indeed, he indicated his unwillingness to have anything to say in regard to the law, by stooping over and writing with his finger upon the ground. They, however, persisted with their question, and Jesus, raising himself, said to them, "You have constituted yourselves accusers of this woman and witnesses against her. Is your haste to have judgment visited upon her because of your own moral competency? Are you, yourselves, so free from sin that you

They ask him his judgment in the case (5–6a)

Jesus at first makes no reply (6b)

His test sends the accusers silently away (7–9)

may be eager to uncover the sins of others? Let him that is without sin cast the first stone at her." Thus without impugning the law did Jesus disarm these self-righteous judges. The whole scene is an application of his word, "Judge not that ye be not judged."

He dismisses the woman (10, 11)

When he had spoken he again stooped down and wrote upon the ground. Conscience-stricken, they slipped away during the painful silence, the older and more thoughtful going first. Only the wretched woman remained waiting before him. When Jesus again raised his head he asked her what had become of her accusers. "Has no one passed sentence upon thee? Has no one said that you should be stoned?" "No one," she answered. "Neither do I," said Jesus. "Such judgment I am not called to make; go your way and from now on sin no more."

II

BOOKS OF REFERENCE

The literature upon the Fourth Gospel constitutes a library in itself. The critical importance of the book as a source of our knowledge of Jesus has made it the subject of ceaseless study and discussion. From many of the more recent works the following selection is offered as helpful to the ordinary reader, on one side in familiarizing him

with the treatment of questions regarding the Gospel's origin and historical worth, and, on the other, with its plan and thought.

The mere reading of books about the Gospel will do little more than give one opinions. No book of the New Testament more fully requires sympathetic study in order to come to a just appreciation of its value. From such a study one rises with an exalted conception of the Master which contains its own arguments for the trustworthiness of the book.

It were well if all questions of Introduction could be reserved until one had in earnest thoughtfulness gone through the Gospel with the help of some interpreter of spiritual insight. In the order of recommendation, therefore, we shall consider first commentaries which are serviceable to this end. Westcott's "The Gospel According to John," reprinted from the Speaker's Commentary (London, John Murray, 1882), is notable for its penetrating insight and concise expression. In few words, it opens up with remarkable clearness the meaning of the text. Godet's "Commentary on St. John's Gospel" (T. & T. Clark, 1887) is fuller in treatment and is marked by lucidity of style, clearness in interpretation, and earnest support of the evangelical conception of the Gospel. A still fuller treatment, though somewhat diffuse, but one which admirably reflects the spirit of the Gospel, is found in Reynolds' "St. John" in the Pulpit Commentary. This work is the an-

tithesis of the concise interpretation of Westcott, but for this very reason it may be to some readers more helpful. It is scholarly, devout, and comprehensive. So also is the interpretation of Dr. Dods, found in the Expositor's Greek Testament (Dodd, Mead & Co., 1897). For those who wish Dr. Dods' explanations without reference to the Greek the volumes on John in the Expositor's Bible (A. C. Armstrong, 1892) will prove helpful. It is unfortunate that Weiss' "Evangelium des Johannes" (Göttingen, 1892, 9th edition) has not been translated into English, but those who can use the German will find it devout, discriminating, and weighty in its judgments. Especially are its "Anmerkungen" worthy of careful attention. Luthardt's "Commentary on the Gospel" will be found of value. The multiplication of commentaries has in it, however, no real gain; any one of those above cited will give sufficient help to one who is himself really studying the Gospel. If a commentary is desired which handles the Gospel critically and carefully, yet from the negative point of view, it will be found in H. J. Holtzmann's "Das Evangelium des Johannes," one of the volumes of the "Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament" (Leipsic, 1893).

For the study of the doctrine of the epistle Stevens' "The Johannine Theology" (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894) commends itself because of its effort to estimate any given teaching through a careful, sane exegesis of the passages upon which the doctrine rests. Dr. Ritchie Smith's "The

Teaching of the Gospel of John" (F. H. Revell Company, 1903) is written from the strictly conservative point of view. It covers more than the Gospel in its explication of given doctrines, but is full and clear upon the portions of John involved in the consideration of each doctrine. Valuable help may also be obtained from the New-Testament theologies of Weiss and Beyschlag; also from Wendt's "Teaching of Jesus" (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892), though in the case of this last work it is necessary before using it to get clearly the author's critical estimate of the character of the Gospel as a source of the teaching. This will be found in the Introduction, pages 22–28.

A recent work written from the negative point of view, but in its handling of the teaching of the Gospel suggestive and able, is E. A. Scott's "The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology" (T. & T. Clark, 1906).

Notable both for their treatment of all critical questions concerning the Gospel and for a setting forth of the doctrine of the Gospel itself, are the articles in Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. II., pp. 694–728, and in the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Vol. I., pp. 869–895. A helpful exposition of chapters 13–17 is contained in T. D. Bernhard's "The Central Teaching of Jesus Christ" (Macmillan & Co., 1892); and especial themes are treated in Hare's "The Mission of the Comforter" (Boston, 1854), and Westcott's "The Revelation of the Father," short lectures on the titles of the Lord in the Gospel of St. John.

Since Evanson in 1792 made his attack upon the Gospel and declared that it came from the pen of a Platonist of the second century, a constant discussion has been kept up regarding the genuineness and authenticity of the book. In this discussion the Germans have taken a large part, and a valuable bibliography of the discussion will be found in Luthardt's "St. John, the Author of the Fourth Gospel," which can be supplemented from the references to the literature found at the end of the Bible Dictionary articles referred to above.

In all the commentaries already suggested extended consideration is given to the questions of authorship and historical value. The following works will be found sufficient for the purposes of the general reader. On the conservative side: Sanday's "Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel" (Macmillan & Co., 1872), and his more recent work, "The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel" (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905). This latter reviews and estimates recent theories and is marked by Professor Sanday's usual caution, fairness, and sanity. Drummond's "Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel" (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904). This contains a careful and judicial discussion of the external evidence and is the more weighty because of the theological position of the writer. Stanton's "Gospels as Historical Documents" (Cambridge University Press, 1903) also considers the external evidence. Not quite so recent as these but still

valuable, are Watkin's Bampton Lectures for 1890, entitled "Modern Criticism Considered in Relation to the Fourth Gospel" (London: John Murray, 1890); three essays by Ezra Abbott, A. P. Peabody, and Bishop Lightfoot, gathered together in one volume with the title "The Fourth Gospel" (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891), and the first volume of Weiss' "Life of Christ," which contains a full and able discussion of the character and worth of all the Gospels as sources for the life of the Master. All Introductions to the New Testament, such as those of Weiss, Salmon, Gloag, Zahn, consider quite fully matters pertaining to John's Gospel.

Negative criticism offers a voluminous literature. Its main positions and their supports may be gained from the following works: Jülicher's "Introduction to the New Testament" translated by Janet Penrose Ward, (Putnam's, 1904); Oscar Holtzmann's "Life of Jesus" (Adam and Charles Black, 1904); Keim's "Jesus of Nazara" (Williams & Norgate); Schmidt's "The Prophet of Nazareth" (The Macmillan Company, 1905); Wernle's "The Beginnings of Our Religion" (G. P. Putnam's Sons); Scott's "The Fourth Gospel" (T. & T. Clark, 1906); Loisy's "The Fourth Gospel." What are called mediating theories as to the authorship of the Gospel, i. e., theories which ascribe the Gospel not to the Apostle John, but to another disciple of the same name, and vary in their estimates of the historical truth of the Gospel, are repre-

sented by Dr. Hugo Delff,[1] Harnack, and Schürer. Partition theories which find a Johannine nucleus in the Gospel and additions by a later hand are set forth by Wendt in his work, "The Gospel According to John" (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902) and by Briggs in his "New Light on the Life of Jesus" (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904).

[1] Das vierte Evangelium wiederhergestellt (1890). Neue Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Vierten Evangeliums (1890).

INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES

INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES

CHAPTER	PAGES
I : 1–18	82–85
19–28	88–90
29–34	90–94
35–42	94–95
43–51	96–97
II : 1–11	98–99
13–22	103–106
23–25	107
III : 1–15	108–112
16–21	113–115
22–26	116–118
27–30	118–119
31–36	119–121
IV : 1–26	122–126
27–42	126–128
43–54	129–132
V : 1	135
2–16	136–139
17–30	139–145
31–47	145–150
VI : 1–21	150–156
22–40	156–161
41–51	162–164
52–59	164–166
60–65	166–168
66–71	168–169
VII : 1–10	171–172
11–13	172
14–24	173–175
25–29	176–178
30–34	178–180
35–38	180–181
39	182
40–52	182–184
VII : 53–VIII : 1	361–364
VIII : 12–20	184–187
21–30	187–191
31–36	192–194
37–47	195–197
48–59	198–201
IX : 1–7	202–204
8–34	204–208
35–38	208–209
39–41	209–212
X : 1–6	213–215
7–10	215–216
11–18	216–219
19–21	219
22–30	220–222
31–39	222–223
40–42	224
XI : 1–16	224–228
17–46	228–232
47–53	233–235
54	235
55–57	236
XII : 1–8	236–240
9–19	240–244
20–26	245–249
27–33	250
34	251
35–36	251–252
37–43	253–255
44–50	255–256
XIII : 1–20	259–265
21–30	265–268
31–38	268–272
XIV : 1–11	273–277
12–17	277–279
18–26	279–282
27–31	282–284
XV : 1–17	284–290
18–27 } XVI : 1–6 }	290–292

CHAPTER	PAGES
7–15	292–295
16–24	296–299
25–33	299–301
XVII : 1–5	302–305
6–19	306–308
20–26	308–309
XVIII : 1–12	314–317
13–27	317–320
28–40 }	
XIX : 1–16 }	320–327
17–22	327–329
23–27	329–333
28–37	332–333
38–42	333–335
XX : 1–10	330–342
11–18	342–344
19–23	344–346
24–29	346–347
30–31	348
XXI : 1–23	352–357
24–25	357–358

BS491 .M4 v.10
Riggs, James S.
The messages of Jesus according to the

BS
491
M4
v.10

99582

Riggs, James S
The messages of
Jesus

DATE DUE AG 19'69 BORROWER'S NAME

Riggs
Messages

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

PRINTED IN U.S.A.